MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2017 9:02 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

### APPEARANCES

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- Mr. Henry Jones, Chairperson
- Mr. Bill Slaton, Vice Chairperson
- Mr. Michael Bilbrey
- Mr. John Chiang, also represented by Mr. Frank Moore
- Mr. Richard Costigan
- Mr. Rob Feckner
- Mr. Richard Gillihan, represented by Ms. Katie Hagen
- Ms. Dana Hollinger
- Mr. J.J. Jelincic
- Mr. Ron Lind
- Ms. Priya Mathur
- Mr. Theresa Taylor
- Ms. Betty Yee

# STAFF:

- Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer
- Mr. Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer
- Mr. Matt Jacobs, General Counsel
- Ms. Mary Anne Ashley, Chief, Office of Legislative Affairs
- Ms. Natalie Bickford, Committee Secretary
- Mr. Dan Bienvenue, Managing Investment Director
- Ms. Christine Gogan, Investment Director
- Ms. Rina Lessing, Investment Manager

# APPEARANCES CONTINUED

# STAFF:

- Ms. Kim Malm, Chief, Operations Support Services Division
- Mr. Simiso Nzima, Investment Manager
- Mr. Anne Simpson, Investment Director
- Mr. Wylie Tollette, Chief Operating Investment Officer
- Mr. Lou Zahorak, Investment Director
- Ms. Gretchen Zeagler, Assistant Chief, Office of Legislative Affairs

# ALSO PRESENT:

- Mr. Dan Crowley, K&L Gates
- Mr. Al Darby, Retired Public Employees Association
- Mr. Rose Dean, Wilshire Consulting
- Mr. Allan Emkin, Pension Consulting Alliance
- Mr. Andrew Junkin, Wilshire Consulting
- Mr. Jose Moran, Tesla
- Mr. Will Pittz, United Auto Workers

	I N D E X	
		PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Executive Report - Chief Investment Officer Briefing	2
3.	Consent Items Action Consent Items: a. Approval of the February 13, 2017 Investment Committee Meeting Minutes	16
4.	Consent Items Information Consent Items: a. Annual Calendar Review b. Draft Agenda for the April 17, 2017     Investment Committee Meeting c. Monthly Update - Performance and Risk d. Monthly Update - Investment Compliance e. Legislation - Federal Investment Policy     Representative Update f. Terminated Agency Pool Rebalance	17
Action Agenda Items		
5.	Policy & Delegation a. Review of the Investment Committee Delegation	20
6.	Legislation a. Federal Investment Priorities	22
7.	Independent Oversight a. Contract Administration: Change to Private Equity Board Consulting Contract	67
Information Agenda Items		
8.	Total Fund a. ESG Asset Class Integration	71
9.	Program Reviews a. Global Governance Principles	159
10.	Summary of Committee Direction	183
11.	Public Comment	184

# INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Adjournment 187 Reporter's Certificate 188

# 2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We're calling the Investment 3 Committee meeting to order. First item on the agenda is 4 roll call, please. COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Henry Jones? 5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: 6 Here. 7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Bill Slaton? 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Michael Bilbrey? 9 10 COMMITTEE MEMBER BILBREY: Good morning. COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Good morning. 11 12 John Chiang? 13 Richard Costigan? 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Here. 15 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Rob Feckner? 16 COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Good morning.

PROCEEDINGS

1

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Morning.

Richard Gillihan represented by Katie Hagen?

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER HAGEN: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Dana Hollinger?

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Here.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: J.J. Jelincic?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Almost awake.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Ron Lind?

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Here.

```
COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Priya Mathur?
```

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Good morning.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Good morning.

Theresa Taylor?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Good morning.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY BICKFORD: Good morning.

Betty Yee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Here.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

The next item on the agenda is the Executive Report, Chief Investment Officer briefing. Mr. Eliopoulos.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Good morning, Mr. Chair, and members of the Investment

Committee. I have a discussion that might take a little longer than our normal 2 to 3 minutes. So i'll just give you a heads up that we're going to cover quite a bit of material, which I think is appropriate given that this

March Investment Committee agenda item really does give us an opportunity to explore and gather feedback from the Investment Committee on some very important areas of work on Calpers sustainable investment strategy.

It includes our focus on Federal priorities for the new Congress, the integration of ESG into our asset classes, and the annual review of CalPERS Global

Governance Principles, plus engagement options for consideration related to the Dakota Access Pipeline. These all represent important areas of work for the Investment Office.

I'd also like to highlight for the Investment Committee in some detail some of the other initiatives we've been working on, which show how we're making progress on our 5-year strategy on ESG.

Overall, we can see significant accomplishment. However, as always, we recognize in humility that we are in the, as Anne Simpson likes to remind me, the foothills of a long climb. I love that analogy towards sustainable investment.

The new strategy, the governance architecture to support that strategy that we've introduced within the Investment Office via the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee of our Investment Strategy Group expanding our talent throughout the Investment Office and realigning for true and real integration within the Investment Office. That's a lot of work.

However, we can see that it is definitely bearing fruit. I'm hopeful that the Committee will see that in the course of the day today. CalPERS can feel proud that the market is recognizing the commitment that this organization is making to sustainable investment.

Two recent examples I'd like to highlight show knew the Board's leadership is being recognized worldwide. In January of this year, CalPERS was ranked number 1 by Extel's report and survey among leaders in the sustainable investment field. We ranked top in their poll of over 1,200 financial analysts in more than 680 firms and 35 countries. This accolade meant a lot to our Investment staff as the competition was fierce.

The top 5 rated investors included some of the world's largest funds at the forefront of sustainable investment, our global peers who we respect and admire. The Extel global rankings, as reported in CIO Magazine in January as I mentioned, their top 5 included CalPERS, as well as 4 of the largest pension funds in Europe, Denmark, France, Norway, and the Netherlands.

We were also pleased to see that the website Savvy Investor cited CalPERS 5-year ESG strategic plan for sustainable investment as one of the top 10 papers for the calendar year of 2016. To have this work highlighted as recommended reading on a mainstream financial blog is very encouraging.

With the tremendous support from our Public
Affairs team, CalPERS insight and opinion is regularly
sought by the financial press. We've benefited from
front-page coverage in the Economist, the Wall Street

Journal, Financial Times and beyond. This shows how we're taking our Investment Beliefs to the mainstream on being long term on the nature of multi-faceted risk and the sustainable value creation we seek through managing not just financial capital, but also human and physical capital.

Here are lights -- some highlights on progress under our framework from the strategic plan. First, leveraging partnerships. We have continued to play a leading role through having a Board role at PRI - thank you, Ms. Mathur - and new staff and Board appointments with partners that are critical to delivering on our strategy. The State Controller, Controller Yee, was appointed to the Ceres board recently, which leads the Investor Network on Climate Risk. On our staff, Divya Mankikar joined the Western North America Committee for PRI to increase our engagement with local peers. And she has been at their meetings in Vancouver and Berkeley recently.

Our General Counsel, Matt Jacobs, has just been elected to CII's board. As you know, Anne Simpson was appointed to the SEC Investor Advisory Committee, and she was just there last week in Washington D.C. on hearings on non-voting shares and financial inclusion. And joining it -- and she has just recently joined its Investor as Owner

Working Group.

Within our fixed income group, Lou Zahorak has been invited to join the Board of FASAC which is the Financial Accounting Standards Advisory Council, which provides advice to FASB, which will certainly strengthen our asset class input into accounting standards.

I've been proud to join the Investor Advisory

Group of SASB, the Sustainable Accounting Standards group
which is focused on material disclosure on ESG. As you
know from the report to the IC -- to the Investment

Committee last year from Janine Guillot and Jean Rogers
their CEO.

We've also seen some significant moves by companies in response to our engagement in proxy voting. To highlight some important themes from our 5-year strategy: On climate change, engagement is bearing fruit. Certainly, many factors are at work in this area, including the impact of the Paris Accord, which CalPERS worked hard to support. We also know that supplies -- new supplies of shale gas and oil are keeping crude prices low. And this is prompting a helpful coincidence of pressure to rethink strategy at the major oil companies.

This is a strong mix, an international policy driver from the Paris Accord, new supply keeping prices low, and gathering financial market pressure from

investors. We are redoubling our efforts on engagement. We're filing proposals and winning high votes following major proxy solicitation efforts across major markets.

We know that the shift to a low carbon economy is a big shift of immense complexity, and immense importance for long-term investors like CalPERS. It has to take place over the long haul, but we see some important moves in the short-term by major energy players.

Looking at the past month alone, the major energy companies we've engaged have taken some important decisions, Exxon, ConocoPhillips, and Shell have together written down billions of dollars worth of reserves related to the Canadian oil sands.

There's also been some significant cancellations. Shell, for instance, pulling out of Arctic drilling for example, while other energy companies are talking openly about the transition itself. Total has said it will become a portfolio energy company with a shift to renewables. And BP is predicting a world of permanent low oil prices, which means that it will be harder and harder, according to their outlook, to extract oil, as it becomes too expensive to reach.

This is a major rethink in the financial world.

And financial modeling and sets the stage for important strategic considerations.

We've also seen a response to our call for climate competent boards, which as the Controller Yee asked, that we introduce into our investment principles. In the wake of a proxy access proposal, which we worked hard to win with our partners in New York City, Exxon appointed its first climate scientist to its board, Dr. Susan Avery. This is an extremely encouraging response in recognition that Exxon needs to bolster its capacity on climate change.

Risk reporting is also improving. Last week,
Chevron released its first climate risk report following a
40 percent vote in support of a proposal which CalPERS
carried out the proxy solicitation. As you know, CalPERS
is co-filing this year at Exxon, Chevron, and Occidental
will be carrying out 17 proxy solicitations around climate
risk proposals to support fellow investors in the
Ceres-led investor network on climate risk. That's up
from last year's total of 12, where we effectively doubled
the level of support to an average of 30 percent plus in
support of these proposals.

Finally of note on the Montreal Pledge engagement, our global 100, which we have dubbed the Systemically Important Carbon Emitters, we are working hard to build consensus with our peer asset owners and investor networks globally. We hope to have a planning

meeting at Ceres April annual meeting in San Francisco and launch the initiative in the summer potentially around the PRI meeting in Germany.

On human capital, we will cover our engagement of banks financing the Dakota Access Pipeline in greater detail during today's presentations. We, in the last month, have carried out a multi-stakeholder dialogue to include labor, indigenous peoples, the banks, the IFC which drafted the Equator Principles, which we'll talk about later in the meeting, and the MLP, which is constructing the pipeline.

We've also helped build a coalition over \$1 trillion of investors calling on the banks to respond to the concerns of the Sioux Tribe. This has led to several issuing statements of concern and support, including by Citibank, which is one of the 2 lead banks.

CalPERS has transferred its talent pool for board diversity to a new home with a highly successful relaunch. It is now housed by Equilar in a Suite of resources called BoardEdge to date, 3D has the highest log-in rate, 78 percent, of any other group in Equilar's diversity network. Equilar confirms that our candidates are receiving profile views by companies seeking directors. Over 50 public companies are currently signed up for the service. The most utilized keywords for those profile

searches are "finance", "international", and "technology".

We are also working hard to encourage other diversity networks to use 3D, in addition to our long-standing partners like Toigo. So far, we've invited the following new groups to join: American Leadership Forum, the Association of Latino Professionals in Accounting and Finance, the Cal-Asian Chamber of Commerce, the California Black Chamber of Commerce, the California Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, California Women Lawyers, California Women Leads 100 Most Powerful Woman Network, Diversity Director, Directory Asia Pacific, Latino Directors, Women to Boards, and Women in Technology.

And on the diversity topic, now is probably a good time to put in a plug for our diversity forum that is coming in May. Specifically, on May 10th, CalPERS will host the 2017 CalPERS and CalSTRS diversity forum at the Sacramento Convention Center.

This event will focus on the business case for diversity, recent search on diversity initiatives that work, and those which may not work, and insight and experience of industry leaders from Harvard, McKinsey, Mellon Bank, State Street, the CFA Institute and other prominent organizations. We're very fortunate to have as our keynote speaker John Thompson, Chairman of the Board of Microsoft.

CalPERS and CalSTRS external managers have been invited to attend, and CalPERS staff is engaging with our establishing external investment managers regarding this event.

CalPERS strategic partners, including the Executive Leadership Council, CFA Institute, Toigo, the Association of Asian American Investment Managers, the New America Alliance, and the 100 Women in Finance have assisted very much in the planning of this event.

Last a note, a topic on advocacy. We've been engaged with the SEC. We submitted a 40-page document commenting on regulation S-K Concept Release, and followed up with meetings with SEC leadership on topics such as diversity and inclusion, and climate risk disclosure.

Last week, we signed the investor statement in support of the SEC's pay ratio disclosure rule. We signed on to the Ceres letter to members of Congress and the new administration and global leaders regarding continued U.S. support for the Paris Accord.

In December, the Financial Stability Board issued recommendations for disclosure on climate risk from public companies. CalPERS responded to the FSB's task force request for comment. And our feedback along with peer funds will go into the G-20 meeting this July.

In conclusion, I think it's fair to say that we

have done a lot in this field. But as always, there is always more we can do. But I want the Investment Committee to know that we as your staff are committed to this endeavor for the long haul, and appreciate all your guidance and support.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you very much on -- for that report.

Mr. Jelincic.

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you, Ted.

The -- you said we wrote a 43-page letter on S-K, which I assume is a good thing, but what's S-K?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: So that is the most important rule in terms of corporate disclosure for companies. It provides the guidance for investors and public companies for disclosure of material issues. So it's the bedrock of the financial disclosure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: So it defines what should be disclosed and what needn't be disclosed?

Okay. Thank you.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Along many other topics, but yes. Thanks for asking.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Chiang.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CHIANG: Ted, can you share with us the level of proxy efforts that we've engaged in? I

know it fluctuates, so the engagement with the petroleum companies this year, what does it look like?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Well, we're gearing up for the proxy season, so we'll have, I think it's 17 proxy efforts on climate change directed at energy companies in this proxy season asking for disclosure of their climate change strategy among other topics. In order to drive the votes at those companies, we're building on our networks of peer engagements. So we're working very hard working with the various associations that I described in my talking points, and this committee knows well, to really drive the vote at these company -- at these companies amongst investor owners.

So the effort will really focus on the proxy season coming up, build on the strength that we had this past year in terms of proxy voting, and hope to increase the percentage of votes in favor of these initiatives in this coming proxy season. It should roughly be over the next 3 months.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CHIANG: Is this year's effort going to look any different than prior years just to give you a context, so -- right, this was elevated to the Board's attention when I first joined the Board in 2007. Calpers, amongst others, participated with Ceres and others to challenge some of the practices in regards to

funding studies -- so-called studies that deny the existence of climate change. And then the next year it elevated in participants from the Rockefeller family joined that particular effort. So I just wanted to see what -- what is being envisioned for this upcoming proxy season?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Our major focus, and we're open to feedback in this regard, because what we want to be is maximally successful, our focus has been on winning the votes and increasing the share of investors on these proxy resolutions. Ideas and thoughts on how we can gain thought leaders in this area to join the effort in other ways are areas that we would -- we would appreciate and welcome input.

COMMITTEE MEMBER CHIANG: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Yee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to just thank you, Ted, for the really comprehensive report and -- but also just to express my gratitude for all of the great work on the ESG strategic plan, because given the amount of uncertainty that faces us, I think it's really -- it gives me confidence that we have a foundation upon which to continue to buildup on our work, and continue to be a leader, frankly, in this space. So I'm very appreciative.

And then just to the ongoing sustained leadership of Anne Simpson and Dan Bienvenue who's just like -- I mean you're just stepping up and taking on huger chunks of this. So I'm just very, very grateful.

I also very much appreciate the specific plans about the Montreal Pledge companies, because I can tell you with a bit of confidence that there are many investors very interested in being a part of this. This was really the momentum that came out of the -- shortly after the UN summit that the Treasurer and I attended in New York. the conversations pretty much started right after that, that came to the culmination that this was something that investors and many of our partners could really sink their teeth into. It's tangible. It's a finite number of companies. And I think you'll see a lot of interest when we have this session at the Ceres conference in San Francisco. And very happy that we're going to work towards a public launch at PRI in June.

So thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Thank you so much, Controller, for your comments and your leadership in this area. It's a team effort. This Board, and the entire Investment Office. And part of what we're hoping to showcase today in the agenda items I think you'll see deployed the full value of our really broad team of

experts with varying strength. And it's a real testament to the hard work of really knitting together the strengths within this office to be deployed at all levels strategically and tactically. So hopefully, you'll see a glimpse of that today.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: I think your announcement about the -- our continuing to work on the Montreal Pledge 100 will probably up the Ceres attendance significantly. So thank you.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you very much.

The next item on the agenda is the action consent item, approval of the February 13, 2017 Investment Committee Meeting --

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Move approval.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Moved by Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Second by Mrs. Hollinger.

All those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Opposed?

Seeing none. The item passes.

Oh, just a minute. I'm sorry, Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, I just had a

25 | question. On page 3 of the minutes, we identify the

speakers and the groups. It's not clear to me that they actually were speaking on behalf of that group. I thought for the most part they were simply given that as -- for identification purposes. And I'm just wondering if the minutes ought to somehow reflect --

2.4

CHAIRPERSON JONES: We really don't know.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Well, maybe we ought to reflect we really don't know then.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. No, that's not appropriate for the minutes.

Okay. Any other questions on the action?
Okay. That item passes.

The next item on the agenda is the consent items, information items. Now, I do have a request to speak.

Mr. Darby, Al Darby, you requested to speak on Item 4, but there are 6 items under 4. So I don't know which one you're referring to. Is it --

MR. DARBY: Asset allocation.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Asset allocation.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Perhaps that's 4f, the terminated agency pool rebalance.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: Or it could be the monthly update of performance and risk, which includes our current asset allocation.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jacobs.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I don't believe you took a vote on the minutes. You had a first --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, we did.

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: You did?

Okay. My bad. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: J.J. had raised a question afterwards.

So, Mr. Darby, you indicated that you wanted to speak on Item 4. You want to come down.

And there's -- if you could -- there's no specific item that refers to asset allocation, so if you could identify the item that you're speaking, we would appreciate it. And also you will have 3 minutes to make your comments.

MR. DARBY: Good morning. Al Darby, vice president, Retired Public Employees Association representing 23,000 CalPERS members from all employers.

As of this date, the domestic public equities market continues to rise. The economy considers -- continues to grow at an accelerated rate. The Federal Reserve is poised to raise interest rates probably 3 times this year, probably Wednesday this week, the first one.

Consumer confidence is high. Oil prices are fairly stable. Construction is strong. Regulation of industry is being reduced. Trade policy will favor

U.S. -- favor the U.S., and taxes will be reduced.

All of these factors strongly support the notion that our bull market can continue for several more years. This would almost dictate a larger commitment to public equities in the asset allocation.

The Wall Street gurus in Monterey, which you all heard in January, almost unanimously recommended a larger public equities allocation. A recent report from Goldman Sachs sees it that way as well. CalPERS has experienced double digit returns in years when the stock market experiences a significant rise. This positive equities performance has repeated itself over the past 20 years on several occasions and is repeating itself now.

Only uninterrupted long-term investing in the stock market can produce maximum benefit from the inevitable ups and downs in the market. Only greater risk produces greater rewards.

In a rising interest rate environment, bond yields decline. Fixed income investments rarely produce above 6 percent annually. Private equity is still illusive for you because of the fees issue and investment opportunities shrinking. Only public equities offers the potential for double digit gains, and this has been proved time and time again by CalPERS. If you chart the past experience, you'll see that.

Prudent infrastructure investment in California may be a useful fixed income instrument. To rebuild the funded status to 80 percent and maintain a 7 percent discount rate, we must see returns well above 7 percent for the next several years in order to restore the funded status of the PERF to 80 percent.

PEPRA will help in the long run, but it's not going to contribute much right now. Restoring public equity allocation to pre-2016 levels would contribute a lot to reaching the 80 percent funded status that we're all hoping to restore.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Darby.

Okay. We'll move to the next item on the agenda,

Item 5, Legislation, Review of Investment Committee
Delegation.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Wylie Tollette, Chief Operating Investment Officer, Investment Office staff.

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

This is the annual review of the Investment

Committee delegation. We are not recommending any

25 changes. I'm happy to take questions. But pending that,

2.1

I would request a motion to approve and move this forward for the full Board to approve next month.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Move it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. It's been moved by Mrs. Taylor, second by Mrs. Mathur.

All those in favor of the -- okay. Just -- question. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Wylie, you said for the Board to approve next month. Is there any reason it can't go 2 days from now?

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: My understanding was that the other committees were going next month. But if they're going this month, then no, there's no reason it couldn't go on Wednesday.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. So...

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well, if others are going Wednesday, then that's fine. But otherwise, we'll just wait until the others are going. Okay. So that's your judgment.

Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Then we -- we had a motion and it's been seconded.

All those in favor say aye?

1 (Ayes.)

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Opposed?

Hearing none. The item passes.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We move to Item number 6, Federal Investment Priorities. And this is where we would get Mr. Crowley on the phone, I think, isn't it.

Okay.

MR. CROWLEY: Yes, sir. I'm here

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF ASHLEY: Hi.

Good morning, Chair Jones, and members of the Committee.

Mary Anne Ashley, CalPERS team member. And here also is

Gretchen Zeagler. She's an Assistant Division Chief in

Legislative Affairs. And she oversees our Federal Policy

Unit. And as noted, we have Dan Crowley of K&L Gates and

his team available on the phone.

We are presenting Agenda Item 6, the Federal Investment Priorities, which is an action item. We are seeking Committee approval of the federal investment priorities for the 115th Congress.

If you recall in November, we began the process of updating and reviewing our legislative and engagement policy guidelines. That item was put over until

post-election, and discussed further in January. And then in February, the Committee decided to dispense with the investment legislative and engagement policy guidelines in favor of relying on other Board-approved documents, such as the Investment Beliefs.

However, also in January, the Board directed

CalPERS team members to work with our federal

representatives in developing federal investment

priorities for the 115th Congress. The priorities provide

a framework for CalPERS to engage in legislative,

regulatory, and policy proposals in a manner that is

consistent with the Board's existing Beliefs, principles,

and policies.

The federal priorities are more specific and are particular to a current congressional session and the dynamics of a current administration.

The recommended federal priorities were developed collaboratively with CalPERS team members and our federal representatives, and they are based on the CalPERS Strategic Plan, Investment Beliefs, and also in consideration of the current dynamics and political atmosphere of the new Trump administration.

And with that, Gretchen will review the guidelines with you. And Dan and his team will be available to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Dan, did you want to make any opening comments before I open the floor up to questions.

MR. CROWLEY: Well, just that, you know, as we discussed at the last meeting, the political environment in Washington D.C. has changed pretty dramatically. And so this set of recommendations is consistent with that new environment.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

And, Gretchen, did you have some comments? I see your light is on.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF
ZEAGLER: Thank you. Thank you, Mary Anne. Good morning,
Chair Jones and members of the Committee. As Mary Anne
said I'm Gretchen Zeagler, the Assistant Division Chief of
Federal Policy and Legislative Affairs. And I'm here to
present the recommended action item on the federal
investment priorities in the 115th Congress.

Very quickly, those priorities are corporate reporting and governance. Under this priority, we would continue to advocate for an enhanced shareowner rights and protections, as well as greater corporate accountability.

Next would be derivatives regulation. Under this we would continue to advocate for open, transparent, competitive, and financially sound derivatives markets.

Next would be Dodd-Frank Act. Under this, we would support reasonable reform efforts to ensure that the Securities and Exchange Commission is able to protect investors, maintain fair and orderly and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation.

Next, would be housing and finance reform. Under this, we would advocate for housing and finance reform that includes a role for private capital, national mortgage servicing standards that protect investors, honor seniority of debt holders, and provide enhanced data access.

Lastly, we would ask for infrastructure priority. Under this, we would advocate for infrastructure plans that include a role for public pension funds. With that, we respectfully request your approval of these priorities. As Mary Anne stated, they are consistent with Calpers strategic plan, Investment Beliefs, and Global Governance Principles.

At this time, I'd like to open up this action item for any discussion or questions that you might have.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, we have a few.

Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So my question is possibly for Ms. Ashley and Ms. Zeagler, but also I'm sure for Crowley. Given that the current administration has expressed a strong desire to move forward with public-private partnerships around infrastructure, and clearly that is one of the priorities that is listed here, how can we leverage that on the pension side to defend defined Benefit plans? Can we? And particularly given our structure of now having 3 separate federal representatives, how do we coordinate that work?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF ZEAGLER: That's a very good question. In this position, we're looking at all of these priorities collectively, and how the organization approaches them altogether.

So we're looking at CalPERS from one perspective. And we are looking for areas where there could be some overlap. We've seen a few come up, you know, particularly with the issues that are surrounding health care, and others in Investments. But I know that Dan Crowley also has a lot to say specifically in that infrastructure, and those P3 partner arrangements. And I know he wanted to offer some input on that as well.

Dan, would you like to speak to that?

MR. CROWLEY: Well, sure. We've had some

preliminary discussions with Ted and his team. And I

think the most direct role that CalPERS can play is as an authoritative expert on what pension funds are interested in investing in. And, in particular, we're looking for repeatable models. There's some concern about sort of the bespoke nature of infrastructure projects in the U.S. Whereas, in Australia, and Canada, and elsewhere, they have more of a systematic model that is repeatable.

And I think, you know, CalPERS is in a perfect position to provide that kind of input, so that there is a stream of investable securities that CalPERS can then participate in. That's it in a nutshell.

We're obviously in the very preliminary stages of discussion about infrastructure with the new administration. They're still staffing up, trying to get people confirmed at Treasury. Most of the recent appointments have been in the -- at the National Economic Council, and it's slower to get some of the other folks confirmed.

But our objective is to have a seat at the table, So CalPERS can provide its considerable expertise to inform those discussions.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. And, Mr.

Crowley, do you see opportunities to sort of leverage our role in sort of some -- in other areas in terms of gaining support for defined benefit pension plans and other large

pools of capital?

MR. CROWLEY: Absolutely. I think that's implicit for -- it's in all of our recommendations, which is to have a seat at the table for discussion on the salient policy issues, and also to advance the rest of the agenda where the opportunity presents itself.

But I think the key, and really sort of the core of our recommendations, is finding issue areas that are on the current agenda, where CalPERS can assert its prerogatives, maintain a seat at the table, and there -- and implicitly advance the rest of the agenda.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. And then I had a second question about environmental and social issues, which are not explicitly listed as priorities here. Are those embedded in the corporate reporting and governance item? How are we going to continue to try to sort of advocate for appropriate disclosure around the E and the S in particular.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: I'll start that off and then I'll hand it off for Anne to take from the strategist's standpoint for sure.

Much of it is encapsulated in the corporate reporting and govern, in terms of advocacy, where the E and the S will be advanced. Much of the work on the environment and on diversity and other social issues we

think will be accomplished in the 5-year plan in the corporate world.

So most of the strategic advancements we see happening in the corporate level for this next 5-year run, and not necessarily depending on either regulatory or legislative action in those -- in those arenas. So it was a choice to focus more on the corporate side for advancements on that side, while not ignoring the disclosure opportunities or defense that we might have to play over the next 5-year plan.

Anne, any...

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you. Anne Simpson.

I think that's absolutely right. We see real momentum in the financial markets, and that's what we want to harness, both with the strategic focus on the Montreal Pledge, the global 100. And also I think a lot of the policy momentum is coming from the international side.

Obviously, the Paris Accord. We don't know yet what the administration's response to the U.S. role will be, but there is such strong commitment from other major economies internationally, we think that that framework is going to remain a robust platform for the engagement with companies.

I think because we have done such good work with

our fellow funds on strengthening shareowner rights, we're in a position to really begin to make progress with companies. And the examples that Ted gave you I think it's early, but they're very encouraging signs that major companies like Exxon and Chevron are responding to the votes that we got out last year.

So we're not hanging our hat on the political process. We really see sound economics driving what we're doing on climate change and diversity. And that means this agenda is a sustainable strategy, to coin a term.

It's something which is going to weather political storms. And that was really intentional when we were putting this strategy together.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: So then just one final question, if I might. I know we had been advocating quite strongly for a price on carbon. This might not -- it doesn't like this is the environment to con -- to be successful there. Is that -- I'm gathering that's why that's not on the list. But do you think that there might still be an opportunity?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Well, there's a really interesting proposal that's come out of the Republican side of the aisle in the private sector, which is to put carbon pricing forwards as a market mechanism. And, of course, this is something on which both sides can

agree. Market mechanisms are really important for driving the response to climate change.

The difference and the interesting twist that they've put on carbon pricing is that every single

American family should benefit from a carbon dividend. In other words, the funds that are gathered in through a carbon tax will be redistributed. So it also chimes in with the idea of sharing in -- sharing in the benefits of the transition. So it remains to be seen I think whether this idea gets traction. But the fact that it has come out of a Republican think tank is very interesting.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: That is.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: So all is not lost. I think we'll sit, and watch, and wait, and encourage. And as Ted mentioned, we did sign a letter with a broad group of investors led by Ceres just to remind Congress and the new administration that there is strong financial market support for the Paris agenda.

And, of course, that does beckon toward carbon pricing, but it wasn't actually included in the final deal. So it's too tricky to get that on a one-size-fits-all basis out of that accord.

And we're also seeing carbon pricing continuing to develop in other markets. I mean, China is making extraordinary progress in this regard. So it's not an

idea that has come to an end at all. I think we're going to see it being experimented with in coming years, and maybe even in the U.S.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Great. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Lind.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you. Two issues.

Just to follow up a little bit on Priya's line of questioning. I guess on the broad topic of climate change. You know, given the fact that we have a climate denier -- climate change denier in The White House, you know, I wonder if -- and given Ted's great report about the great work that we do - and obviously long ago, we've identified climate change as a serious long-term investment risk - how that isn't a priority for us defending, you know, attacks on the environmental protection agency, and a lot of, you know, other issues that obviously are coming to the forefront. So I'm wondering if that might be -- why that might not be a priority or close to one.

My second issue is on our work around Dodd-Frank, and, you know, the language about support reasonable reform efforts. The reality is I think we're more likely to be having a priority of opposing unreasonable reform efforts, again given the situation in Washington. And I

would like to see that -- that reworded a little bit, so that we -- it's very clear to our lobbyists that we want to play some defense. We want to oppose attacks on Dodd-Frank. So I would suggest we somehow, you know, manipulate that language a little bit.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ted, you want to respond to that?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Sure. Let me -- on the Dodd-Frank side, and Dan Crowley can speak to it as well, we're very well versed in the key priorities within Dodd-Frank. And we'll be aggressively looking at whatever reforms are proposed to make sure they work for investors. So the language, one way or the other, I don't think you need to be concerned that we're not going to be paying attention to the changes that are going to be made. But your attention to the nuances of the language or even the statement in the language is well taken.

I'll pause -- I'll pause there to see if Mr.

Crowley, who's the person that will be executing, you know, sees it the same. But let me stop there and then I'll take up the climate change point second.

MR. CROWLEY: Sure. Well, I think it's important to remember that what we're -- what we're proposing here is going from strength to strength in terms of preserving the gains that Calpers has worked over a period of years

to achieve.

And, in particular, the Title 7 reforms relating to the derivatives market, and in particular the fiduciary duty owed to special entities like CalPERS, is not currently at risk. It's not in any of the legislative proposals on the table. We expect Chairman Hensarling's Financial CHOICE Act to be reintroduced here in the next few weeks.

But the draft he had last year really reserved a lot of the gains -- the hard fought gains that CalPERS worked on for many years. And that's why we, you know, are suggesting that we work to support reasonable reform efforts.

There are a number of other provisions of Dodd-Frank on which there is bipartisan agreement that there are unintended consequences. And we've seen just last week a series of bills marked up in the Senate Banking Committee and the House Financial Services Committee that passed both committees with overwhelming bipartisan majority.

So certainly, we are prepared to respond if we need to object to provisions that are bad, but I think it's also important that we're there to embrace the good.

On the -- on the climate change issue, I think, you know, the key there is just -- we're trying to focus

the lobbying efforts on issues that are currently on the agenda in Washington D.C. But I want to emphasize the points that Ted and Anne made about the fact that they're still very much on the agenda in the corporate governance world, both domestically and internationally.

And Ted went through the organizations that Calpers senior management are involved in with Matt at CII, Anne at the Investor Advisory Committee, Lou at FASAC, and Ted in the Investor Advisory Group. I think all of that is really important to keep in mind, but I just want to also mention Calpers leadership role on the international corporate governance network. I think Anne Simpson, in particular, has worked over a number of years to position Calpers very effectively in the international community.

And the reason that's important is that while the political pendulum will continue to swing both ways in Washington D.C., that international community around corporate governance and ESG will withstand any of the short-term political jockeying. So I would encourage you to consider remaining an active participant on the international level as well.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Clearly, you're hearing that's a theme from your Investment staff

as well, that we -- we think we should focus on climate change on all of the initiatives that we have pointed at these networks, and at the financial world. We think that's where our voice will have the most impact.

We will take occasion to sign on to letters and write letters on topics related to climate change, but we think in terms of our priority of our engagement, it should be focused in the financial markets for this next 2-year run.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Slaton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SLATON: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

I want to come back to an issue that I talked about when we discussed this topic in January, and that was the need for flexibility in the federal lobbying area. And as we're seeing in the health care arena, sometimes things can move very rapidly, and we only meet monthly.

So I want to come to page 2 of 3 of the document in the background section, second paragraph last sentence. And what this -- what the document says is, "They do not bind the Board in considering or adopting a position on any specific proposal, nor do they supersede or alter any existing policies, beliefs, or principles".

And that's fine, but I would be more comfortable

if it said they do not bind the Board or staff, because you're the operational folks, along with our federal lobbyist, who have to execute. And there will be things that will occur when we're not meeting. So I would like clarity that we are giving you the authority to take positions consistent with the policies that have been established by this Board. But I think that needs clarification there.

Thank you.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. And I -- and the Chair} \\ \text{would direct that that be changed. Okay.}$ 

Okay. Mrs. Yee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have a couple questions. One is kind of a look back, if you will, certainly predating my time on the Board. But I was interested or curious about the priority setting that maybe took place after the last market crash, and how -- did it go through kind of a similar process with respect to how we identified our priorities back then?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: I'm going to turn it over to Anne in a second here, because she was right in the midst of that turmoil. It went through a similar, but more intensive, process I think following the financial crisis of extreme looking at what -- what places

to concentrate our effectiveness. But what came out of that turmoil was a focus principally on what became the Dodd-Frank Act, housing finance reform, which you'll remember was at the center of the storm of the financial crisis, and derivatives regulation.

And CalPERS, I think, coming in the financial crisis and coming out of the financial crisis played a very significant role in developing what came out to be the new protections around transparency and clearing houses for derivatives reform.

We've always had a focus I think on corporate reporting and governance. I think if we had a priority listing going back 25 years, it would be -- it would be there each time. So what's new this time really is the infrastructure engagement that we're proposing. I don't know, Anne, if you want to add anything to that in terms of the crisis?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: No. Thank you. I do remember those days very well, because that was when I was being recruited to CalPERS. And Joe Dear, who was also being recruited to CalPERS at the same time, Joe played a very important role in something called the Investor Working Group that was set up by the CFA Institute and CII, which really gathered great minds and big funds around the table to shake out, well, what do we

think went wrong?

We also did our own sort of consideration. I remember going with the engagement team to meet with the banks which had received TARP money to simply ask the question of the lead directors and the chairs of those banks, well, what happened, and what's the plan for making sure we have some safety for next time?

So I think the 3 themes -- I mean, touching on derivatives, as Ted said, but Eric Baggesen and others had real impact on the rule writing around derivatives reform.

And I think real progress was made.

The other big area of work was credit ratings. And the fixed income team and Curtis spent a lot of time. We gave testimony. We also met with regulators. And although the financial solution on credit rating reform was not achieved, which is that they work for investors not for companies. There were a lot of really important steps that the SEC and the other regulators took, you know, to make sure, first of all, that they're regulated, that they don't have privileged information, that their data and methodology are disclosed. So I really think there was tremendous progress in that area.

On the corporate governance agenda, I think it really focused our efforts on the engagement in proxy voting around majority voting. Because although it isn't

very long ago, it wasn't actually possible to hold boards accountable. We weren't able, however large, however long term, to vote against the reelection of a board member. So we started a 5-year plan, which was to say if we can't hold boards accountable, then you can just about whistle for everything else.

So we, you know, did, you know, great work by Todd Mattley and others to start with the top 50 companies in our portfolio and work our way down. Now that work continues, but it's extraordinary to think we were running campaigns at these big banks and these big companies simply to get the vote.

So I really think the crisis highlighted that lack of accountability, which wasn't very visible, and it was a tremendous effort right across the market to make improvement. But again, you know, to echo Ted's comment this morning, we're humble. We know that we've made some progress here, but there's a heck of a lot still to do.

You know, and I have to say I think one of the areas we didn't look at was the whole world of supervisory bank regulation through Basel[bal] or Basel{bas-el}, depending on how you prefer to pronounce it. But, you know, matters like too big to fail, capital adequacy, a lot of that financial sector reform was embedded in that Investor Working Group agenda that Joe Dear worked so hard

on.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. So I guess given that -- and I can appreciate that all these priorities are, to some degree, interrelated, and -- but it seems to me that to Mr. Lind's point that, you know, I think our position should be kind of in the affirmative with respect to kind of preserving and protecting what we've got. I mean, it was a long hard-fought battle since the last crisis.

And so, I mean, I would agree with Mr. Lind to kind of take that more affirmative approach to just, you look, at it with respect to the other protections that we currently have, and comment on the changes that are being proposed as they come.

To Mr. Slaton's point about how do we then have the process that would allow for a shifting or priorities? And particularly on issues of health care and maybe perhaps to some degree the immigration debate could really have some impact on financial markets as well. So -- and I guess maybe to Mr. Crowley, how would you -- I mean, I though you're -- you're nimble on the ground for us, but what kind of a process do you contemplate if those types of things should take the attention of everyone?

MR. CROWLEY: Well, I think if you look back to the model that we established in the fall, after Gretchen

Zeagler joined, I think, you know, Gretchen has added tremendous value as sort of the hub on the wheel, if you will. And we are in a position to be monitoring developments in real-time. And we often communicate daily with things that are happening. And then Gretchen is very good about getting us feedback from the right people inside Calpers.

And the result was that we were able to get a number of letters out very quickly that were relevant and, I think, you know, positioned CalPERS effectively at the time. And I would hope that that's a model that we can continue. But I couldn't agree more that staff need to be empowered to make those calls on the fly, because when they do come up, they tend to be very short-fused items.

And so I think we've got a system that's working, but certainly subject to periodic review. As we get further into Dodd-Frank reform, there's no doubt that there will be a number of, you know, sort of fast-breaking items that we will have to be responsive to. So I think we've got a pretty good plan in place.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. Great. And I would just ask that that plan just also include obviously some real-time communication to us, so that as we're out and about we're aware of positions that maybe staff has taken. So that would be terrific.

And then my last question has to do with how are we working, Dan, with -- I guess with you being on the ground, how do you identify, I guess, other partners that could, you know, help lend voice to these issues, whether they be our colleagues in other states or other investors? But I think obviously CalPERS is very much looked upon as the leader, but I still do believe in the strength -- in having strength in numbers, so...

MR. CROWLEY: Yeah. I couldn't agree more.

Leveraging relationships and identifying third-party advocates is part and parcel of what we've been doing.

And I think, you know, having as I've reviewed the senior management in CalPERS involved in these various organizations, I had the privilege last week of speaking at the Council of Institutional Investors meeting on a panel with the former SEC Chair Harvey Pitt and former SEC Commissioner Annette Nazareth.

And what I was struck by was the breadth of the people in the audience. It really was the entire institutional investor community not only pension funds, but also sort of the large registered funds as well. And as you say, there's strength in numbers. And so I think, you know, staying involved in those organizations, being aligned whenever it's appropriate, signing on to joint letters, but also being willing to step back and, you

know, use some discernment, in terms of whether you want to be on every letter.

Because I think as important as it is to leverage those outside resources, it's equally important to maintain your posture as a credible and authoritative opinion leader on issues that are being debated currently. And sometimes that means not signing on to every letter, if it's simply posturing as opposed to trying to advance the agenda in some positive way.

So I think you have to use discretion, and that involves some give and take and continuing discussion.

And again, I think we've done a pretty good job of that over the last 6 months or so.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Great. That's terrific,

Dan. Thank you. And then I guess to Gretchen and to Dan,
in terms of the monthly reports that we will be receiving,
to the extent that these are the priorities that have been
identified, I assume that the report will be structured so
that the priorities will be kind of the topics. And we'll
get updates on each of those, and anything else that might
be added in the intervening time?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF ZEAGLER: We can certainly do that. We can update all of the monthly updates to include what priorities that we're seeking after touch on. That's very doable.

45

```
1
             COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. Very good.
 2
    you.
3
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: And so does that address
 4
    real-time concern that you raised earlier?
             COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: I think the monthly
5
6
   report, but there may be things that will be moving --
7
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Faster.
8
             COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: -- more furiously on a
9
    quicker pace. So if that's the case in between meetings
10
    and rise to the level of, you know, I think our being in
11
    the know, I would like some communication.
12
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, I think that's a valid
13
    request.
14
             CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We'll work
15
   with our CEO to --
16
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.
17
             CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: -- provide
18
    the Committee memos in between the months.
19
             COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: That's great.
20
             CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We have a
21
    good process for that.
22
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.
23
             COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you.
2.4
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mrs. Hollinger.
25
             COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Thank you.
```

appreciate the update. This -- Mr. Crowley, this is for you. It's regarding the infrastructure. I know under the previous administration a lot of money was set aside for infrastructure deals. But it was my understanding that to get those deals done in the United States, it could take 20 years, where Europe, Australia, these other countries, you know, those deals can be approved in about 2 years. So I wanted to know what are we doing specifically to create that opportunity and potentially streamline that process?

MR. CROWLEY: Well, that's a very good question. And the candid answer is that we're in the very beginning of what will likely be a long discussion around those issues. My marching orders so far from your investment team are to find opportunities for CalPERS to commit knowledge and expertise, but not necessarily capital.

As you will recall, the Obama administration was always interested in getting commitments from pension funds and others to fund particular projects. And so our directive has been to take a step back and take a broader view of what's possible and seek to position CalPERS, as an opinion leader, as these issues are discussed.

But I think we're in an -- we're in a preliminary phase internal to CalPERS and also a preliminary phase internal to the new administration. So far, they've been

kicking around ideas involving tax credits primarily, but I think there's a lot of work to be done on both sides.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Got it. I just want to make sure that in expending our efforts, we do it in such a manner so that they're doable. You know what I mean? Otherwise, it's just theory.

MR. CROWLEY: Yeah. I think that, you know, the idea of trying to look around the globe for models that are repeatable, and are, you know, oriented primarily toward brownfields initiatives as opposed to greenfields initiatives, this is the type of feedback we've been getting from your investment team so far. And again, we're in the preliminary stages, but we'd be happy to discuss it along the way as these ideas crystallize.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Two questions. I'll throw them both out there and you can figure out the sequence to answer them.

Recognizing you have to do these in advance to get them to us, and recognizing the stability in the Trump administration - he said sarcastically - the -- would you have changed any of this if you were writing it today rather than a month ago when did you write it? That's question one.

And the other question is, Anne, you said that China is making some significant progress on carbon pricing. And I don't know whether the point to ask you about that is here or in your report later. And I will give you the option of where it fits better.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you. Yes, China has had 5 major cities piloting carbon pricing. And you'll have seen when it had the Presidency of the G-20 last year, the Peoples Bank of China chief economist, Ma Jun, who's a tremendous ally in all of this work, he chaired a Green Finance Task Force, which includes important work in this arena.

So China has been ahead of the U.S. in terms of taking major metropolis and industry areas to pilot. And now, their plans are to ramp this up to a bigger scale. But maybe we could provide you with the Green Finance Task Force plan, which China led, because that's now intended for the G-20 as a broader plan to drill down from the Paris Accord into more detail on these sorts of policy measures.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF ZEAGLER: And to your question on would these issues change if we -- if we wrote them today?

So what's interesting to note here is essentially

within this current administration, we're seeing a lot of the same issues. What we're seeing though is a dramatic perspective shift on those issues, and that's what we're really looking to really capture. There are a lot of things that we anticipate could come up, but they're further down the road. And from all accounts that we're seeing, what's being reported in the media, what we're getting from Dan and others that are, you know, on the Hill, these are definitely predominantly the issues we think are likely to rise within the first 100 to 200 days, I think, particularly with regard to Dodd-Frank Act.

We know that we're going to see something. And I can let Dan speak to that a little -- a little more closely. But for issues like infrastructure is mentioned on the Board, that was an issue that we were always looking at, is again it's just a perfect example of that dramatic shift in the focus and how we're going to harness that to the advantage of CalPERS.

But I think Dan probably wants to offer you a little bit more perspective on this as well.

Dan.

MR. CROWLEY: Yeah. Thanks. I think, you know, on Dodd-Frank, the freight train has slowed a little bit for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that the administration has not fully staffed up, and

therefore, you would expect Treasury to be providing input on Dodd-Frank reform. Among the bit of open questions are what did Secretary Mnuchin mean when he said during his confirmation hearings that we need to have a modernized Glass-Steagall for example.

That's certainly not coming from the Hill. And so I think the Hill process has slowed somewhat to provide an opportunity for the administration to staff up and to provide input. And also, I think there's been a recognition that in order to get anything through the Senate, they're going to have to attract 8 Democratic votes.

And so I think that's why you're starting to see the -- both committees moving legislation in bipartisan fashion.

To just address the question is there anything we would add to this? The only thing I can think of is that -- and this is probably covered by your tax and retirement team, but to the extent that there are tax issues that overlap with the investment agenda, I think we will be coordinating on those. And I'm thinking in particular about the border adjustment tax, which most people are thinking of, I think, with respect to goods, and how it might increase the cost of imports from China on the store shelves at Walmart, for example.

But it's important to remember that it also applies to services, and to intangibles, like royalties, and goodwill, and things like that. And so it has a direct impact on financial services and investment issues. And so that's also something we're working -- we're keeping careful tabs on, and we'll be working with your tax advisors where -- in the areas where it overlaps with investment policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thanks.

Ms. Simpson, you made reference to a document you said that was available in response to Mr. Jelincic's question. So could you just provide that to all Committees members.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Yes, we'll be glad to. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you, Mr.

Chair. I appreciate the report. And I think we -- I

think you have done a great job on identifying what's

important that we look at right now under this current

administration. I wanted to kind of walk back to Mr.

Lind's point about the Dodd-Frank Act. And, Mr. Crowley,

I'm not sure I heard an answer in terms of making sure

that we oppose reform. I think what you were saying you talked about there was bipartisan support for specific things that have gone through right now, because there are fixes that need to be done to Dodd-Frank.

I've been reading that some of that bipartisan support, however, is still issues that could deteriorate the protections of Dodd-Frank. So I think it's important that we're careful about, you know, oh, well, that's bipartisan support. But I think there are a lot of times where we're looking at that bipartisan support tearing down Dodd-Frank, because there's a lot of bank lobbyists there talking to both parties, and they're listening.

So I want to make sure that we are recognizing that Dodd-Frank was put in place to -- to stop what happened in 2008, and that we're not letting it get stripped. And I know that that's something that's primary or you wouldn't have identified it, but I just wanted to make sure that Mr. Lind's point about opposing any efforts to strip away these protections somehow be -- it doesn't necessarily I guess have to be in this, but I think it's important that we recognize that.

And then I think the second point I wanted to make sure I got to was keeping Ms. Yee's point about keeping us in the loop, and -- absolutely. I hope that -- you know, that everybody can feel like they're nimble and

can respond quickly, but at the same time keeping the Board in the loop, so that we can have knowledge of what's going on, and input, if we need to.

But I would, Mr. Crowley, ask that you answer to the issue -- oh, and then my last point was on the housing finance reform, I'm not -- I think there's an issue that's just like the Dodd-Frank reform, where we're looking to advocate for housing finance reform that includes a role for private capital, but we're not talking about making sure that those protections are still in place, so that those mortgage companies cannot continue, or cannot start doing what they did before to bring down the economy.

So I wanted to make sure that we are recognizing that we're opposing any stripping of both of these issues.

And I wanted to hear your thoughts on that, Mr. Crowley.

MR. CROWLEY: Well, sure. I think, you know, the letters that I referred to a little while ago, I think were all in the category that you described of opposing certain changes to Dodd-Frank. And, in particular, one letter had to do with the reforms to the SEC that would impose cost-benefit analysis, and things like that, that look to us like really more of an effort to tie the SEC up in knots, as opposed to reform anything.

And so we sent a strongly worded letter to the Committee opposing that provision. We did the same with

the proposed reforms on proxy advisors, where we very strongly opposed. And that was an example, by the way, where CalPERS chose to send its own letter as opposed to signing on to joint letter, which was sort of more political and less substantive.

CalPERS, I thought, took a very constructive approach of offering concrete suggestions on how to improve what was pretty clearly a bad proposal from CalPERS perspective.

Another had to do with opposing the increase for the threshold for disclosure for private equity funds.

CalPERS is on recent record as opposing those things. And if they come back up in Financial CHOICE Act 2.0, please be assured that we'll be right there to continue the opposition.

On the other hand, I think it's important to remember that Dodd-Frank was passed in about a 14-month period, and revisited every financial services law from the 1864 National Bank Act through Sarbanes-Oxley. And both Chris Dodd and Barney Frank have said publicly repeatedly that there's no way to cover that much waterfront quickly and get it all right.

And so that's why I emphasized the fact that there is a lot of bipartisan agreement on needed Dodd-Frank fixes, but that is not, in any way, to suggest

that we won't also be there to vigorously oppose changes that we disagree with.

On housing finance reform, the point is very well taken. I think some of the reforms implicit in Dodd-Frank will be things that we will need to talk about. And just to throw one issue on the table that, you know, we will have to work with your investment team on to come up with a position one way or the other. Dodd-Frank contains a risk retention rule that was intended to have banks hold a share of the risk on their balance sheet before they securitize residential mortgages.

But it applaud -- it applied much more broadly. It applied to credit card receivables, auto loans, and bunch of other things that really had nothing to do with the residential mortgage crisis.

And so that issue will be on the table, and we're going to have to sort through to determine what the CalPERS' position is going to be. And there are, as you might expect, two sides of the coin. On the one hand, you have a strong interest in minimizing risk, but on the other hand, as investors in the markets and in a lot of the companies that have been adversely impacted by an overly broad risk retention rule, you may very well decide that changes to that provision are appropriate.

But I think our key and our goal is to make sure

that CalPERS is positioned with -- A, with a seat at the table, and B, as a credible opinion leader, so that when we do weigh in, it has some impact. That's the ultimate objective.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: All right. Thank you very much. And then one last question, and this may come from my ignorance. I'm not sure. So strongly worded letters, I've heard that several times, that we send out. And, of course, you know, having our opinion out there, what other strategies do you employ when -- I mean, are you visiting legislative offices? What other strategies do you deploy?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF
ZEAGLER: I'll start that and then follow up with Dan, but
yes, we have a variety. So one is from the stakeholder
perspective. We look at harnessing the energy there. I
think we mentioned that earlier. The second would be
letters. And then, of course, obviously, congressional
visits.

In September, both Dan Bienvenue and I went and made a lot of visits. I believe that we have plans to do that very soon again, and continue that on, as well as Dan's relationship -- Dan Crowley on the phone -- and any other opportunities that we see fit beyond just monitoring, but any opportunities for engagement. We're

looking at wherever they can come. But, Dan, would you like to add to that.

MR. CROWLEY: Yeah, I think we're making good strides there. I still would love to have a sense of when CalPERS principals are going to be in D.C., and in particular Board members, because we can capitalize on that. You can't minimize the value of sort of water cooler chit chat and walking the halls of Congress. James Andrus did quite a bit of that last year I think very effectively

But there's no substitute for having principal-to-principal interaction, both in Washington and in California. And so to the extent we can put senior staff and Board members, as available and appropriate, in front of policy-makers, I think that that's something we need to pursue as part of the strategy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Excellent. Thank you very much. I like that.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Could I -- could I add one additional area of work that I think is helpful? And it's giving testimony when there are hearings.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Excellent.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: And we were invited to give testimony for the reading in the House Financial Services Capital Markets Subcommittee, when the Financial

CHOICE Act was getting its first reading. And that was an opportunity really for CalPERS to scope out what our priorities are, and also to take some of the hyperbole out of the discussion around issues like shareholder hyperbole rights, where a lot of ideas we're kicking around that weren't very well grounded in fact.

So I think written and oral testimony is also a way for us to have a presence with Congress.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CROWLEY: That's a very good point, Anne.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Good.

Yeah, Dan, I'm glad to hear that your response to Ms. Taylor's question regarding the Board members' engagement, because you may recall at the off-site in January, the majority of the Board suggested that we make sure that Board members are engaged and make these visits to policymakers, so that when the issue does come up, you have a relationship already built. So I'm glad to see that you've indicated that that would be part of your plan.

Okay. Mr. Lind.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you. I think we're probably getting close to voting on this, but I wanted to

step back, because it kind of went fast to the issue that Mr. Slaton raised about the sort of the month to month and taking positions. And then, Mr. Chair, you said you'll -- you're going to direct that change. I'm not clear what actually was the direction of change.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: He wanted to add in that last sentence in that section, it makes reference to the Board, and he wanted to add staff, so it reads staff and Board.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Okay. So I've got a concern about that, and let me raise it. And, look, I have full trust and faith in our team and all of that, but, I mean, it sets up the potential that Board and staff, you know, could take a different position, not that that would, or hopefully would ever happen. But it just seems a little awkward.

Might I suggest that we just say they do not bind CalPERS in considering or adopting positions, because if the sentence -- or the clause starts with CalPERS, I think it ought to end with CalPERS. That way it's real clear, it's the organization. We're all working together as a team.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah. Okay. As long as it's the whole -- embodied the whole team, so -- okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: With that, I'll move adoption of the policy.

```
1
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Second.
 2
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. It's been moved by Mr.
3
    Lind and seconded by Mrs. Mathur.
 4
             We have further discussion.
 5
             Ms. Gillihan -- no Ms. Hagen.
 6
             (Laughter.)
7
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER HAGEN: That works.
                                                           Good
8
    morning.
9
             (Laughter.)
10
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Sorry about that.
11
    reading to the right.
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER HAGEN: No problem.
12
13
    We're commonly mistaken, the two of us.
14
             (Laughter.)
15
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER HAGEN:
                                              I have a
16
    question. In reference to the Dodd-Frank discussion, and
17
    I was going to ask it further down in the agenda, so let
18
    me know if it's not appropriate to ask that question now.
    But there was -- in February, there was an -- in the
19
20
    media, there was some discussion about reconsideration of
21
    the pay ratio rule implementation around Dodd-Frank.
22
    I was wondering, there's -- I understand there's a 45-day
23
    comment period currently. And it sounded like from the
24
    media, it allows the companies that are struggling with
    compliance to submit comment. But I was wondering if
25
```

CalPERS was planning on submitting comment during that comment period?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you very much. Anne Simpson. Interim Chair Piwowar has opened up this consultation for companies who is, as you rightly say, may have further comment on this rule. We're joining quite a major group of investors, although, perhaps not formally invited to comment, to lend our support, and reiterate the good economic arguments for having disclosure about compensation right through the companies.

You know, we're very grateful to know about the top 5, but most companies rely upon teams right through the organization. We recognize it's only one data point. It doesn't give you a full picture of how employees are being incentivized, or how compensation is being developed across the company. But it does give companies an opportunity to provide that data point and then to explain it.

And that is the start of a very important discussion around the management -- effective management of human capital, which is one of our important concepts in the Investment Beliefs.

So that -- the comment period is open till March the 22nd, I think, but certainly worth speaking out. And we did write initially to support this rulemaking. And I

think the SEC gave some excellent guidance to companies on how to -- how to implement it.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER HAGEN: Right. I was just wondering specifically around the delay aspect of it, because it seems like they just keep kicking it down the road further. And I didn't know if we were weighing in on that. Just curious.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: I think a lot of the SEC's work has been hit by budget -- budget cuts. And currently, the SEC is hit by the federal hiring freeze. So chiefs of divisions went, and have not yet been replaced. So we got some sympathy with the slow progress, and it's why we support full independent funding for the SEC. It will then able it to move more quickly, where it has a mandate from Congress.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER HAGEN: Thank you. That helps. I just assumed it was the companies that were delaying and not actually impacting SEC. So thank you for that view.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Slaton.

VICE CHAIRPERSON SLATON: No, I didn't.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh, no?

Okay. Mr. Costigan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

I didn't know we were going to move so quickly, so I do have a few questions.

On the bullet point for Dodd-Frank, support reasonable reforms. What I had understood Ms. Taylor to talk about was potentially some opposition. So the language only says that they'll support reasonable reforms. What if it's something we don't like? Where is that set forth?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Can I take that one up?

Just the -- what we took the discussion to mean, and maybe it would be helpful for it to be more explicit language, is support reasonable reform efforts. We think that is important for all the reasons that have been discussed.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Oh, I agree with that. It's the inverse.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: And then maybe we can add to get to your line drawing question, which I think is a good one, Anne and I put some language together for you to think about. So support reasonable reform efforts and protect core provisions. That would give us some guidance as to those things that we would try and either oppose or advocate against. It's really the core pieces of it. We do see lots of technical changes

that should be made on the edges, but the core provisions we should support or even oppose.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Right. I think it needs to be as clear as possible, since we're delegating authority. So right now the bullet just says support.

And if they were to take a position to oppose anything, they would not have the authority to do it.

I also have a concern, Mr. Chair, as it relates to housing finance reform. One of the principles is honor the seniority of debt holders. And if I recall correctly, and I can't remember how far to go, but in the Stockton case, one of the issues actually related to debt holders.

And so we are now -- now that was not a priority I believe in the bankruptcy matter, was we saw priority as CalPERS over the debt holder. And yet, now we're going to be advocating a position of supporting seniority of debt holders. So I'd like someone to sort of reconcile that for me.

Because again, that was an argument in the Stockton case was -- I'm going to look at him. I'm looking at you -- because there was one bondholder who made that argument that we said no to.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We clearly weren't thinking or applying this in the context of priority between municipal holders of debt or pension

funds versus private debt holders. This, in the housing reform context, applies to the level of mortgage holders from first to second to third.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: So why would

Calpers -- I'm just curious, why would we advocate a

position of honoring the seniority of debt holders? Are

we a debt holder?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Yes, we're a significant --

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Yes.

2.4

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: -- housing mortgage holder.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Can you walk through that, please?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Matthew Jacobs.

I think our position in the bankruptcy was that -- and will continue to be that CalPERS has priority, or rather that the bankruptcy court jurisdiction does not extend to being able to reduce pensions of cities who are in bankruptcy. So if you want to think of it in terms of consistency with the priority that's been put forward, it is consistent in the sense that we believe we have first priority.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: All right. Then I would actually suggest Mr. Jones, either potentially

adding a word seniority of mortgage debt holders. Just any document out there talking that honors the seniority of debt holders seems awfully broad to me. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. The maker of the motion, Mr. Lind, the language that Ted mentioned to add, "and core provisions", does that meet with --

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: That's acceptable.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. It's acceptable.

Okay. So good. Okay. And what about the second part to

senior -- what was your statement, seniority?

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: To add the word "mortgage" in front of debt.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mortgage. Okay. Mortgage. Okay. Good.

Okay. Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. I have no particular problem with that, but this bullet point relates directly to housing, you know. And so I don't think you can say we're talking about housing and therefore we're implying something elsewhere.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. That -- we're going to take a vote on this. But before we do, I want a clarification on the role of private capital. The reason I'm asking the

question, I was reading recently where a private equity firm is building houses, and going through Fannie Mae and et cetera. And the comment was that they would -- these debt would be more expensive to the mortgager.

So what does private capital mean here? Is the it traditional banks, and savings and loans institution, or are we talking about private equity types of private capital?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: No, it wasn't -- it wasn't referring to private equity in this -- in this sentence. It meant more broadly a provision. And we would consider even CalPERS capital to be private in that context.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. Okay. So there's -- it was moved by Mr. Lind and second by Mrs. Mathur with the modification.

So all in favor, say aye?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Opposed?

Hearing none. The item passes. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Dan.

MR. CROWLEY: Yes, sir. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Okay. Now we'll move

25 to the Item 7, Contract Administration: Change to Private

Equity Board Consulting Contract.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Investment Committee.
Wylie Tollette, CalPERS Investment Office.

This is an action item related to recent changes associated with your private equity Board consultant relationship. You will note attachment 1 in your materials that is a resignation letter from PCA effective March 13th, today.

And so that change precipitates some decisions for the Committee, again related to your -- you private equity consultant. The first you have to decide whether you're going to accept that resignation. Second, we would request that you authorize staff to then contract on your behalf for a interim private equity Board consultant for the remaining term of the contract.

And then last, but not least, consistent with the Private Equity Board Consultant Policy, we have an ongoing work with Meketa, who is who we are proposing as your interim private equity Board consultant. We have current staff work, and that your policy requires us to request authority to continue to use Meketa for that time period. We expect that work to be done by June, so we're requesting that associated with this action item.

So 3 things: accept the resignation, authorize

staff to contract on your behalf, and then allow us to continue and wrap-up the existing staff work with Meketa. So with that, I'll take questions.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Yes. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: On 2, you know, contracting with Meketa. I assume you will try to negotiate rates down and all that stuff that we normally do.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: We actually already did undertake that negotiation, and Meketa was unwilling to budge from their original proposed fees that were outlined in their RFP back in 2015. They indicated that if they were to bid it again today, they would actually come back with a higher fee. So from their perspective I think they -- they thought this was a reasonable fee.

It is more expensive. It's about \$235,000 more expensive for the remaining term of the contract than the existing fee with PCA.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: And then the other question is actually for legal. Are we on solid legal ground to do this outside of an RFP process?

GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: I'm going to defer to Kim.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:

7.0

```
1
             Thanks, Matt.
             (Laughter.)
 2
 3
             OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
 4
             Kim Malm --
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: She said
5
6
    sarcastically.
7
             (Laughter.)
8
             OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
9
             -- CalPERS team member.
10
             We are use utilizing an Investment Office
11
    spring-fed pool that is currently established. It has the
    same types of actions and activities that your RFP had.
12
   And so we are able to go ahead and utilize that with your
13
14
   permission to do a letter of engagement to do the
15
    services.
16
             COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.
17
             OPERATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF MALM:
18
             Thank you.
19
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you.
20
             Mr. Feckner.
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
             I move staff's recommendation on all 3 points.
22
23
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Second.
24
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Moved by Mr. Feckner,
25
    second by Mrs. Mathur.
```

71

```
Questions?
1
 2
             Seeing none.
 3
             All those in favor say aye?
 4
             (Ayes.)
 5
             CHAIRPERSON JONES:
                                 Opposed?
 6
             Hearing none. The item passes.
7
             CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:
8
             Thank you.
9
             CHAIRPERSON JONES:
                                 Thank you.
10
             And I would just like to thank PCA for their work
11
    and contributions on our private equity portfolio. And we
    look forward to continuing to work with them in their
12
13
    capacity as our real estate and secondary general
14
    investment Board consultant. So thank you for the past
15
    service.
16
             Okay. Moving now to Item 8, ESG Asset Class
17
    Integration.
18
             (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
19
             presented as follows.)
20
             CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS:
                                                    So Mr.
21
    Chair, I'll kick this off. We have quite a team coming up
22
    to the dais here. And I'm going to give time.
23
    hopefully just the sheer time and number of people coming
24
    up here really is much of the point today that the work of
    ESG asset class integration is a team effort across asset
25
```

classes, across disciplines, across a variety of skill sets and across a very large, and complicated, and complex portfolio.

So the work of over the next 5 years of putting together the framework and the actual activities of integrating these considerations into investment decision making reaches into every part of the portfolio, as well as the Investment Office itself. And I hope beyond anything else today, in terms of the words that are spoken or conveyed, this concept of our team being deployed across -- across the field by really talented professionals is really one of the main messages, in addition to how complex the effort is going to be over time to weave these considerations into really the different components of the different asset classes and the business models that we employ.

So with that, I think I'd pass it over first to Dan and then to Anne, is that the plan?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: I think just me.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Okay. Just you.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: All right. Dan Bienvenue, Managing Investment Director for Global Equity.

So as always, joined by Anne Simpson. Certainly Anne and I are partners and compatriots in this effort and joined at the hip. So joined by Anne Simpson, and then also by the senior members of the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee. We have Lou Zahorak, an Investment Director with fixed income; Christine Gogan, an Investment Director in Private Equity; Rina Lessing an Investment Manager in Real Assets; and hopefully soon to be joining us is Simiso Nzima and Investment Manager in Global Equity.

On slide 2 you can see -- and I don't know if we have the clicker somewhere. Oh, there we go.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: On slide 2 you can see that the topics for consideration today are just to briefly talk about the strategic plan that we developed together between staff and the Board working together to come up with a plan on what we're tying to execute in this space. Then we'll look at the structure that we use to achieve it, both from a organizational structure, but then also a governance structure. And then finally we'll take a deep dive into asset class by asset class what we're doing across the asset classes.

Both in December when we talked about manager expectations and then again last month, it was very clear

to us that there was an appetite for a real deep dive an understanding on behalf of the Committee to understand what we're doing in this space. And certainly the idea of this item is to take that deep dive and take ample time to really dig in.

Each asset class will have a couple of minute presentation 2, 3, 4 minutes, and then plenty of time for the -- for Board members to ask questions. So that's kind of the idea for this.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Moving on to slide 3, and as mentioned and very much appreciated by Ms. Yee, this is our ESG strategic plan. Obviously, we view this as our -- as our guiding light in terms of the implementation of our ESG priorities, certainly along with discussion with the Board and across our whole team. And as Ted referenced the term "team", you'll -- you'll probably get tired of hearing me saying the word "team" this morning, but it really is the case that it's a -- it's a team, and we view actually the discussion on the previous item being something that we view also very importantly, which is that we're one team with the Committee working together to get this activity done -- this very important activity done.

So you'll see our 3 columns, which are

environmental, social, and governance. They are the E, the S, and the G. And then also horizontally, we've got our strategic work and our core work.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: So if we move now to slide 5, I'll just walk briefly through what the key initiatives are. From a strategic standpoint, they are data and corporate reporting standards; they are the work as discussed earlier on our engagement with the Montreal PRI companies, the large carbon emitters in our global equity portfolio; our work around diversity inclusion; the work on manager expectations; research; and then finally, of course, private equity fee and profit sharing transparency.

So those are the 6 main strategic initiatives. That said, that's also in addition to all the core work that's going on around carbon footprinting and responsible contractor policy, proxy voting, shareowner campaigns, and corporate engagements. And then, of course, partnerships, and then all of the legislative things which we discussed in Item -- in Item 6.

So that was the sort of what of how we're going to achieve. On slide 6, we start off with the how we're going to look to achieve it.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: And one thing you'll notice is that we made a handful of organizational changes trying to be as effective as we can in this space.

First off, we established the Sustainable

Investment Program under the leadership of Anne Simpson.

This is intended to be that -- that we've used the term

"hub", but this is the sort of central point of our

strategy work, our policy work, building our partnerships,

all of the work that is kind of the -- the really forward

looking trying to drive the strategic initiatives.

Some of the core work we've actually moved into some of the asset classes and programs really trying to get the activity closer -- closer to the assets that represent the activity so to speak. So in the case of the federal legislative and regulatory work, we've moved that into the Execution Services and Strategy Team, or ESS. In the case of proxy voting engagement, we've moved that into Global Equity to put it right next to the assets. And then finally the divestment work we moved into ICOR, Investment Compliance and Operational Risk, just because that team is very effective in this space.

But critically, and one thing you'll see again on the future slides is that this is all about a team. And so while we have these org structures, we are very much

working as a team to get this activity done.

So if we move on to slide 7 --

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: -- this shows the sort of governance structure. And primarily Ted alluded to it in his comments around the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee, or the GSS as we refer to ourselves. That's how this team comes together to drive this very important strategic work for the Investment Office, and really the entire enterprise.

The GSS is a subcommittee of the ISG, or the Investment Strategy Group. Please recall that the Investment Strategy Group is that core deliberative body around investment decision making and investment policy setting.

And the Governance and Sustainability
Subcommittee of that Investment Strategy Group is tasked
with making sure that ESG risk and opportunity
considerations are integrated into the investment process
and the investment decision-making process specifically.

It's co-chaired by Anne Simpson and myself.

Again, I mention that Anne and I are joined at the hip on a lot of these topics. And this is one of those where Anne Simpson and I co-chair this committee trying to really make sure that we integrate the ESG topics into the

investment decision-making process.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: If we move forward to slide 9, this really represents the team. So this is the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee. You'll note that it's made up of very senior level members from across both INVO and the enterprise. And you'll notice that every asset class is represented with senior level people, Investment Director and Investment Manager level folks, some of whom are up here with us. And then also senior people across the program, whether it's ICOR and otherwise.

Further and importantly, the enterprise is represented, again bringing us together as a team. So we've got senior members from Legislative Affairs, from Public Affairs, an from Legal.

So this is really a strong and thoughtful team of people brought together to really address this critical strategic body of work.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Finally and though obviously there's a number of people listed on slide 9, if we move on to slide 10, you can see that there's even a greater depth of digging into these topics. So in addition to the main Governance and Sustainability

Subcommittee, we have a number of working groups.

Because of the fluidity of these topics, and the need for expertise in this space, these working groups further broaden and deepen the expertise that can be brought to bear on those topics. These working groups are led by members of the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee. But they again go deeper into the asset class with -- asset classes with further representation.

So we have a Working Group on Financial Markets, under the leadership of Don Pontes. We have the Proxy Working Group, under the leadership of Simiso Nzima. And then, of course, a Research Working Group that's all about staying on the cutting edge of what's going on in this space and making sure that we're continually moving ourselves forward under the leadership of Anne Simpson.

So very much a team effort looking to implement the Board's strategic direction in our work with staff.

And with that, I'm happy to take any questions before we move on to the asset classes.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Seeing none so far, so move on.

--000--

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: All right. So I'll pass it over to Lou Zahorak to start us with fixed income.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Thank you, Dan.

Today, we have the representatives from each of the asset classes to discuss ESG integration. As a group, we are here to communicate and answer your questions on how our internal and external asset managers are integrating ESG analysis into their investment process.

In order to provide a consistent framework in our presentation, you'll see that we chose to use the UN PRI principles to show how we are moving forward and toward the goal of ESG integration.

I'd like to go to slide 2.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: In global fixed, we manage over 90 percent of our assets internally, so we have more direct control over ESG integration. The specific portfolios within fixed income where we apply ESG integration is really focused in our corporate portfolio, and then also in our foreign non-U.S. sovereign bond portfolio.

Both areas use various measures to assess ESG risks. For example, in the corporate team, we use ESG ratings and research data on specific companies, while the sovereign team focuses on governance indices, such as indices that measure corruption, transparency, and income inequality in countries.

On the next slide are specific examples of portfolio decisions that were made by our corporate and sovereign investment teams in the application of ESG integration.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: The first example we'd like to cover is from our corporate portfolio, where our analyst identified governance risk existed in the ownership structure a Viacom and CBS. Our analyst also determined that the bonds and our portfolio did not have covenants for change of control. A change of control covenant helps to protect an investor if a company is sold and leverages increase significantly. Fortunately, our team was able to sell the bonds that we owned, and purchase bonds that had the change of control language that we wanted with minimal impact in the portfolio.

The second example is from our sovereign portfolio. And during that time, the sovereign team reduced their exposure to several countries. The reason they did this was that after considering the potential economic and financial risks, as well as identifying that several countries had high scores on the corruption indices, and in terms of transparency, they decided to sell down the risk.

What I'd like to stress from these examples is

that in both cases we did not use ESG ratings or governance indices in isolation. We look at the ESG risk factors like other investment risk factors. And it's the job of the portfolio managers to really determine if the price of the securities provide compensation for all of the risks, not just ESG.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Now, in terms of what we are doing with our external managers in fixed income. We started surveying and having discussions with our external managers regarding ESG over 2 years ago. And as of 9 -- now, 8 of our 9 external fixed income managers are signatories to the UN PRI. The one remaining external manager that did not sign does integrate ESG into their investment process.

So what are the next steps for ESG integration in fixed income?

The first is we will be coming back to the Board in a future months to review a carbon footprint analysis of our corporate portfolio. And by year-end, we plan on updating the guidelines of the internal and external managers to reflect the requirement that ESG risk be incorporated in our investment processes.

And now, I'd like to open for questions, if there are.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yes. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah on slide 13, you talk about the use of covenant review. Can you describe the process and when you actually go dig out the indentures to look at it and --

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Sure. You know, it could be as soon as a bond is issued when it comes to the new issue market. There will be covenants with regards to, as I mentioned, change of control, limitation on liens restricted payments. So when we're offered a bond - like this morning, there were various bond offerings - our analysts will review those specific documents.

If we're reviewing a portfolio -- our analyst is reviewing an existing position, that's where, in this case, the Viacom bonds were a bond which had been existing in the portfolio, the circumstances in terms of the economics and where the stock of Viacom was trading, and how it had declined in price, and what was going on with the Redstone family, increased the risk we thought that there could be a leveraging transaction, so we relooked at those bonds and looked at the situation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: So you look at new -- when you're doing a new issue, you read the covenants?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: And then other than that, it's when something comes to your attention that there may be an incremental risk and then you go back and look at the covenants?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Yes, yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Lind.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you.

I just wanted to compliment you on this small piece of the report, particularly the action examples, because, you know, as -- when we've heard these reports in the past, and I've been one that's always sort of pushed back. Okay. We've got -- you know, you've got the policies and things you talk to managers about, and we've got the metrics, and the ratings, and all, but what kind of investment decisions do you actually make based on all of that? And these are great examples of what you've done. So I really appreciate you putting this piece of it together.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Thank you.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Yeah.

For what it's worth Mr. Lind, this is very intentional.

We -- we really tried to hear everything the Board had to say over several sections, and then tried to incorporate that. So one of the things is examples, and you'll see

those across the asset classes.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, first, I just want to say how happy I am to be spending so much time talking about these set of risks and opportunities that I -- you all know is one of my areas of interest and focus. And I think a lot of really important and good work has gone into this, so I'm so happy to be a part of this.

One question I had, and I guess it was sort of back to Dan's opening presentation. On page 7 of the presentation, it talks about governance and sustainability as ensuring that risk considerations are integrated. But on the following page, it talks about risk and opportunity. And most of the presentations that I've -- or most of the asset class focus has been on the risk side. But I'm wondering and I -- and it will bring me to my question on specifically to fixed income, to what extent are we also focusing on the opportunity side? And with respect to fixed income specifically, are we looking at green bonds? What does -- how are we evaluating that set or other opportunities?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: So why don't I start with the Governance and Sustainability

86

Subcommittee slide. And to be perfectly candid, I stole 1 this slide from Wylie --2 3 (Laughter.) MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: -- to 4 5 try to use a slide that you had seen before. 6 (Laughter.) 7 MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: 8 belief is, looking at the -- exactly -- looking at the 9 slide itself, my guess is that since opportunity is such a 10 long word, it was hard to get it to fit, but it was 11 absolutely the case that we are looking at risk and opportunity. In my comments, I mentioned risk and 12 13 opportunity. 14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Yes. 15 MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: And you 16 will -- it will always be both sides. It certainly is a 17 risk consideration --18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Yes. 19 MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: 20 very much an opportunity consideration. 21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: And it's in the 22 23 charter, which we --2.4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Yes. On the following

page, it was listed there. Yeah. Thank you.

25

And then with respect to green bonds.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Sure. With respect to green bonds, we -- when a new issue does come, as I'd mentioned, we look at green bonds. And we will look and see if they meet the parameters of our portfolio first of all.

The history that we've seen so far the last several years is, first of all, our portfolio tend -- is managed against a benchmark, which is 7 years and longer. What we've seen is the preponderance of green bonds have been from non-U.S. issuers, and they've been shorter than 7 years.

There was an issue that came up in the past year, literally in the last few months, which we had looked at hard. We assessed whether it was compensating us at the same level of interest rates. And I can't remember necessarily if we did invest it. I think Curtis looked at it in his portfolio, so we did give it a hard look, and it -- but I'd have to get back to you as to whether we actually invested in that.

We did?

We did invest in it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. Thank you.

And then my final question is on page 13, you

25 | said -- you state -- it's stated there under the second

head bullet, the first sub-bullet, "Quarterly review of our internal credit portfolio positions to ESG scores".

Could you expand on what that means --

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Sure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: -- and how you use --

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Sure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: -- the information, and...

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Sure. We have ESG ratings on every company. And what we do is we -- we're managing a \$10 billion portfolio with approximately 200 different companies in it.

What we look at is the names that we are the most overweight, the most underweight that have the very poorest ESG scores. And then we'll take that list, we'll give it to our analysts that are covering those companies in those specific industries, and we ask them 4 questions.

Number 1, explain the risk that's cited from the poor rating. Are you concerned about this risk? Is the rice -- risk priced into the security? And should we change our portfolio due to this risk?

And we do this in a forum where we literally get all 10, 12 of our analysts, our PM team in a conference room and we go around the table one by one asking those questions, answering them. And the purpose of this is

that, number 1, the analysts see that we're serious about this, that we keep ahead of -- on top of these situations, and that we have a dialogue about the ESG risks that could be prevalent.

An example of what we learned is, and this was a learning moment was that one of these reviews, the analyst that covers the paper sector, you know, explained to us that water risk was really important, because there was -- the paper industry in the processing used a very large volume of letter water.

Well, you know, not everybody knew that, that was around the table. So that was a learning moment in a sense. And that -- there's value in that.

The other example that I mentioned about Viacom and the governance risk. What that kind of spring-boarded us into a discussion of, well, what other companies in any of the other industries have a similar corporate investment structure. And then from there, we can do a deep dive on those companies and look at the covenants in the bonds of those companies.

And from that, we also ended up having expanding some additional training for our analysts, specifically on corporate structure and covenants. So, you know, the process -- I say the process has served us in many different ways, in terms of, you know, improving our

awareness of ESG risks on a broader basis on our team.

And I would say that for fixed income, ESG awareness is really -- it's predominantly for risk management. Barclays Capital Came out with a research -- research piece recently, and they cited that in corporate bonds, the one risk factor where there is benefit is in the governance side.

They do not see statistically that, you know, using an ESG rating for envi -- the environment or for society added to any reduction in risk in a portfolio, but on the governance scores it does. And so those are the ones we really are also focusing on in a very focused manner.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: And what was the time frame of the Barclays analysis?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: It went back, I want to say - it was a longer term study - 5 or 10 years. And what it was looking at was if a company had a lower ESG rating and you -- you created a portfolio, what -- what was the returns versus a random portfolio?

And what they found was that companies that had poor ESG governance scores tended to have more ratings downside risk. And thus, if they had more ratings downside risk, you ended up having more price -- potential price depreciation.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. Well, thank you. It sounds like a robust process. I'm really happy to get the expanded view.

Thank you.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR ZAHORAK: Sure

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Yes, thank you.

There we go.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to compliment you on the report so far. I just -- I'm very, very impressed on how deep the dive is. One of the things I think that you guys know that I'm concerned with, and it looks like you're starting to incorporate is metrics on how we're going to kind of measure our accomplishments and how we're going forward.

So I want to make sure if we could, in our reporting -- right now, it looks like we're kind of in first steps. And I get that, but I would love to make sure that in our reporting we're including metrics on how we're getting there, measurables of some sort. And I know that some of this is hard to measure, and we're coming up with the standards on how to measure this, and how to measure our success. But these examples are great examples of how the successes are happening. So maybe there's something that you guys are coming up with.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Yeah.

So you alluded to a number of really important points there. One, this is an evolving area, and we're -- we are trying to figure out how to measure, and how to just determine our effectiveness. We do think, as Ted mentioned earlier, that some of the scores that we've received from Extel and others is something that we're very proud of.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Right.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Recall when we went through the strategic plan for each of the 6 strategic initiatives we came up with KPIs at Mr.

Slaton's -- that request. And certainly, that's very important, so that will be probably the main measuring stick, but we are going to continue to try to figure out our metrics on how we're -- how we're being successful, because there will bit little ones along the way. For example --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Sure.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: -- when we were here in February Simiso mentioned that we're now down to, of the, you know, 9 companies that didn't have an element of diversity on the Board, we're now down to -- down to just 1.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: The one, yeah.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: And we are working through that. So there will be constant -- constant measuring, both at the micro level, and we'll try to share those, and then also really importantly at the KPI level.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: That's excellent. I appreciate that. And then I had one other kind of a comment for Anne. The -- on page 10 of the presentation, it shows that you are over the Research Working Group, and it's an organized approach to understanding research, and emerging trends in ESG. And how much of that is us? Because aren't we the thought leaders in this?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Yes, but so easy to let the crown slip.

(Laughter.)

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: We -- we really use this group, and it's only just begun of course, to bring in a broader group from the Investment Office. So it's not just the subcommittee members who sit on it. But an example will come up here in the next item when we look at some new language in the principles.

The first thing we did was look at our own sustainable investment research initiative. You remember we've twice now done a complete review of the academic literature. So that's fantastically important for staying

with the scholarship on the topic. But also what we look at is what our global peers are doing, because the most important thing we get from the partnership is not just pooling influence and sharing resources, it's also sharing best practices. And to stay at the cutting edge, we really want to learn from the best.

So it's sort of a "pracademic" approach -
COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Good. I like that.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: -- practical and
rigorous and academic. And I think that we've made real

And where we don't know, being willing to put our hands up and say, well, this is just something we have to watch and we have to encourage. As Dan said, our focus on data and corporate reporting is where we want to drive more information into the market, that that will then allow us to demonstrate where the risks and opportunities are connected to this agenda.

progress by being focused on evidence.

And right now, we're strong on some issues, and elsewhere we're having to use our insight and experience and we don't have the data.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Great. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Yee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Great. Thank you, Mr.

Chairman. I must say I'm sitting here quietly bursting as well with tremendous progress, and just really want to thank the staff for the deep dive. I had a couple questions, and I know this will probably take time to work through. But as I'm just looking at the organization of kind of the subcommittees and the working groups, I guess what I'd like to encourage, and you all will know this over time, but it seems to me this Research Working Group needs to be kind of threaded throughout, because that kind of drives, you know, a lot of the current thinking and kind of what's, you know, best practices. This is just done in finance.

So, I mean, I just see that as kind of being a little bit more overarching, and it seems to be kind of on equal par, but just something to explore going forward.

And then I -- just in relationship to the federal priorities discussion we just had, I wanted to get your feedback with respect to how nimble these different bodies are going to be in terms of responding to, you know, kind of emerging priorities. And we're in this world of where, you know as I said, issues can just kind of start coming in sideways, and are we going to be equipped to really respond, and let's just say, you know, some federal action related to the SEC or, you know, some environmental, you know, policy change that could really be devastating to

our work here.

But I guess I just want to get some assurance that we -- we'll be nimble enough to act quickly and to be able to respond.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Nimbleness piece, you see I was so anxious to jump in, because it's something that we talk quite a bit as a leadership team. And this governance structure is so important to be nimble --

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Yeah.

Anne and I, we would joke quite a bit over the last couple years that she and I would be kind put in the position of supplicants going around to the asset classes trying to get feedback, because we didn't have an organized governance structure in place for this type of consideration to put in place. And it really impeded our nimbleness, because we would literally have to go down the halls and track down various asset class experts to get individual opinions. And it was just too unstructured, unorganized, so that we were unable to be nimble.

We're taking the time to get organized. And the benefit of these working groups and the governance structure is they're across the whole asset class structure. And we have experts that are feeding into the

leadership of the asset classes, so that while it seems like a lot of bureaucracy at the front end to put these governance structures in place, having them in place do 2 things for us.

One, they're a ready-made forum for discussion and building up of team work and also expertise, but the scores that Lou mentioned and our own work in the SIRI tell us that governance is the most important factor that we've been able to see in the evidence across the spectrum of investment management for performance, so we need to have our own well governed architected structure to deliver on this as well.

Anne.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Yeah, I just wanted to give you a couple of examples. This image of Ted is he and I running around the corridors begging for 10 minutes from a lot of different people. Well, we got a lot done, but it wasn't efficient. So what we're able to do now is send out even -- we have monthly meetings. We've got a charter. We have -- Dan and I meet and prepare an agenda, so we can have input from -- people can raise things, put them on the agenda

But the other thing we're able to do is this rapid consultation. So a good example is the latter that New York invited us to sign to Texas on LGBT rights. We

were able to send that around, not just for the asset class input, but from the Legal Office, who are extremely helpful - thank you, Salony- and Public Affairs got heads up that something is coming along as well. So it's given us a very fluid way to get input from all sides. And I think that's invaluable.

The monthly meetings we can have the discussion and the feedback from the research groups, but we're using email just to, you know, get lightning speed when we need it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Sure. Okay.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Yeah.

And the only thing I would -- I would add to that is
exactly on the working groups, they are staffed with both
enterprise people -- just to underscore what Anne said,
both people from the enterprise as well as the Investment
Office.

And the idea of the working groups is to get -bring expertise to bear. So there are people around that
may or may not have the expertise, but to bring that to
bear and then come to a recommendation to the governance
and sustainability subcommittee, which to Ted's point,
that's about broad ownership of the position whatever that
is. And even going back to Ms. Hagen's question on the -on the SEC pay ratio, that was another one where, you

know, the topic came up. We knew we had plenty of time, but we also really wanted to get ourselves, actually in advance of this meeting, get ourselves to together with a perspective on that.

And I think we got agreement in about 2 days through people looking at it, emails going around making sure everybody was comfortable in every asset class, and the programs. All the voting members of Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee were willing to -- or we're comfortable saying yes, we should -- we should sign on to this letter. So these are the ways, to Ted's point, on trying to be more efficient and more effective in this space.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Yeah, that's great. And I think certainly the presentation herein is demonstrating that has come to bear.

I am going to ask you to just consider whether this Research Working Group ought to be a little bit more overarching, because I do think it has the potential of informing, particularly with outside perspectives on a more regular basis. And I think to the extent that there are so many, as -- during Ted's presentation this morning, I mean, there's just so many interested parties that are going to be very supportive of what we do, and it might be that we can get to their quicker if we have the input and

the ability to share some of those outside perspectives, so -- but I'm just going to put that out there and see how that can be incorporated down the road.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Seeing no further questions, we're going to take a break in a minute, but I do have one question in it goes to Ms. Taylor's questions about the ratings and ability to see how we're doing. You know, the G of ESG we do very well. Have been doing very well for a long, long time. And the S we're beginning to make some inroads, and achieving some very high goals in that area.

But the E is new. And so even though you're collecting information, and I'm sure there's value from collecting that information, but there's no standard in the E. And so my question is we have received a presentation from SASB both here and at our off-site. So what's the status of that, so that we ultimately can get to a point where we have some standards to measure how we're doing.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: It really underscores the inn of having adopted standards across all industries, on ESG. And so SASB is up and running. The Investor Advisory Committee chaired by Chris Ailman that I'm on is meeting regularly. They had -- SASB had its first public corporation agree to adopt the SASB standards

for its corporate reporting recently.

But it's going to take -- it's a long -- it's going to be a long task, but it really -- it's a commercial for the need to have recognized standards, particularly uniform and material for the measurement purposes that you're underscoring. It doesn't -- it doesn't make as much difference for us to just measure the decisions CalPERS is making internally, if we have a set of data. The market, as a whole, will be using that data and measuring the effectiveness of it, so, that you, know future studies will be able to point to whether or not the E and the S factors played a role in improving or detracting from performance. And that's the key metric that speaks in the investment world and will move the needle the most in this area, if we have adopted measures.

So, yes, I think the work of SASB is going to be important, but it will take every bit of the next 5 years, I think, to make progress.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you very much.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Could I -- could I add something, Chair --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yes.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: -- specifically on this issue of environmental reporting. CalPERS has identified climate change, risk and opportunity, as the

cross-cutting issue over time, and also across markets, and across our asset classes. And Ted touched on it briefly this morning in his overview, but the Financial Stability Board task force has issued a set of recommendations for disclosure on climate change, which we strongly support, because they cover governance, climate competent boards, strategy, risk, but also data and metrics, Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions, and so forth with specific guidance by sector.

Now, SASB's been an active supporter of this, but what's important I think for us is that we've got the moral authority and the economic clout of the world's central banks behind the idea that climate change is a systemic risk potentially. So moving this disclosure into the absolute heart of the financial risk industry is very significant.

The -- we've been very involved in helping develop the recommendations. They're going to the G-20 in June. And if they're adopted by the G-20, we'll have a global framework. That's going to help us with engagement. But I do not doubt that many markets will be starting to attach this type of reporting into their required regulatory disclosure. So I think that's going to jump start the environmental side. But I fully agree, the E is where it's new, and we're finding our way. But

103

this initiative is really going to make some big impact, and we're really looking forward to seeing what starts to come out through that.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you very much.

Mr. Jelincic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Ted, you said that the first public corporation adopted the SASB standards. Who was it that -- I think they kind of deserve a shout out.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: They do deserve a stand out[sic], but I want -- I don't want to make -- make the mistake of misidentifying them, so give me -- after the break.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Then we will take a 10-minute break, and so we will return at 11:25.

(Off record: 11:16 a.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 11:25 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: I'd like to reconvene the Investment Committee meeting, please.

Okay. Okay. Ready to go?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Great.

24 Before I hand it over to, I think, private equity is in

25 | next, on the SASB. The first public company to announce

alignment of their 10-K disclosures with SASB is actually it's a real estate investment trust, Kilroy, based in Southern California. So we thank them for their pioneering effort.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Send a shout-out to them.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We just did.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: All right. Good morning. Christine Gogan, Investment Director, Private Equity. I'm happy to be here this morning to talk with you about ESG integration in private equity. Turning your attention to slide 17.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Turning your attention to slide 17, during the pilot period, private equity has explicitly built ESG considerations into both our monitoring, as well as our investment decision making processes. It is important to recognize that many of the private equity staff's responsibilities include ESG, whether it is the staff who underwrite the investments, the people who manage the investments on a day-to-day basis, or the people who run the operations for the group.

All of these professionals have a component of their job that touches upon ESG. During the pilot period, private equity staff has taken a two-pronged approach.

First, in the investment management process, staff has been focused on understanding how ESG policies are implemented and monitored. Whereas, during the underwriting process, staff is focused on understanding how ESG matters are incorporated into the general partners decision-making process.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Specifically on page 18, you can see that staff implements several of the UN PRI principles in our investment processes. Underwriting staff uses several questions from UN PRI's limited partner responsible investment due diligence questionnaire in our own underwriting process.

Further, in our monitoring efforts, we are actively engaging our general partners regarding ESG issues and practices as this area continues to develop in the private equity world.

Importantly, staff has been engaging with other limited partners to explore how we can move towards discussing private equity ESG issues in a more uniform fashion across private equity strategies and funds. Staff recognizes that there is not one single source that

provides an exhaustive list of ESG factors pertinent to all private equity investments, so we look for those pertinent ESG factors that are relevant to any particular investment.

On page 19, we share some of our high level conclusions from the pilot period. The majority of the commitments private equity made over the last 16 months have included an ESG section in the legal documentation. Not surprisingly, larger general partners are leading the way with ESG. Also, we would point out that CalPERS is typically one of the limited partners that is eager to engage in ESG topics, and often brings this at either the annual meeting or the Limited Partner Advisory Committee meetings.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: And page 20 and 21 we wanted to share with you 2 examples of the ESG integration in our portfolio. On page 20, Axalta, a global manufacturer and distributor of coatings is discussed. As you can see one of the coatings manufactured by Axalta is applied to building roofs, absorbs solar heat, reduces air-conditioning coasts and helps customers meet LEED criteria. Axalta also redesigned its coatings to work with high strength composites and plastics needed to meet more stringent auto fuel economy standards.

And a second example is depicted on page 21.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Vogue International, who is a U.S. manufacturer and distributor of hair care and other personal products is discussed. Vogue has implemented environmental criteria into its ingredient selection and new product development, gradually eliminating ingredients of concern.

Additionally, Vogue has introduced new product labels made from less fossil fuels, less energy and water, as well as reducing greenhouse gas emissions resulting in a savings of 26 percent to 34 percent in every category.

These sustainability actions have made the product more attractive both to consumers, as well as retailers.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Last, but certainly not least, I wanted to update the Board on a key governance initiative for private equity. Progress has been made on the ILPA fee and profit sharing template, which is displayed on page 22. Private equity staff has been working diligently with all of our general partners to communicate the importance to CalPERS of having fee and profit sharing information provided to us in a uniform and consistent manner over time.

CalPERS now has 5 consecutive quarters of collecting the ILPA fee template. Over this time period, we have seen improvement in the overall provision of the templates, such that overall, we're receiving templates from a little over two-thirds of our funds, or about 80 percent by net asset value.

CalPERS believes the standard templates offer significant benefit to the limited partner community in terms of collecting and understanding key cost metrics.

Turning to page 23 --

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: -- I'd like to provide some closing remarks before we engage in some questions here.

Staff has surveyed our existing manager base regarding both who is a UN PRI signatory currently, as well as who has a ESG policy in place. As you can see, a limited number of our existing private equity managers are currently UN PRI signatories. However, a larger number, about 40 percent of the manager base, does have a formal ESG policy.

It is fair to conclude that private equity
managers are increasingly adopting formal ESG policies.
Staff continues to engage both limited partners and
general partners regarding the importance of the ILPA fee

template as a consistent uniform mechanism to collect detailed fee information.

Staff will also continue to engage both general partners and limited partners regarding ESG issues in general.

At this time, I'm happy to take any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Ms. Gogan.

Mr. Costigan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Jones. I just have some general questions more about private equity. So first, on the right-hand column -- along my page, sorry -- when you get to governance, how do we ensure that private equity firms that own companies are diversifying their boards?

Because I've looked at a series of them. And while we're over on the public equity side and we're able to go over and vote on Board members, we don't seem to have that same ability. So how do we ensure the other side?

And then I have a follow-up question.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Yeah, and I will start out answering that question and ask Ms. Simpson to jump in as well.

Simply stated, we don't have a direct right as a

limited partner based on the structure of the commingled fund to actively engage directly in who is on the Board. However, I would say a major social initiative within private equity is when we're developing relationships with general partners to convey the importance of diversity to our organization, to the partners in which we invest in, and to encourage them to try to adopt the same principles that we adopt on the public side.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: So down the road, why are we not bringing in those private equity managers and having this discussion with them, so that they understand? So I -- again, some concerns when you look at the lack of diversity overall in private equity. I mean, they all own a series of companies, privately-held companies with boards of directors. I mean, it's this granular.

You know, you just talked about the 2 and 20 in fees. Now, we've got to start rolling down, because you've got the parent company, then you've got the subsidiary, then you've got -- and we've been through this before.

The other is -- is on the social and governance aspect. A large ride-sharing company has recently been in the news, because their CEO didn't seem to have control over the way their hiring practices and retention of senior employers, and allowed certain things that if

happened here, we'd have zero tolerance for. How do we address that?

So you have a company with explosive growth, it stays privately held, that appears on the surface to lack governance structure. And if you look at -- I know it's a commingling. There are couple of the companies that invest in that ride sharing company who we invest with. I mean, a Goldman Sachs, Fidelity, things of that nature. What is the accountability?

And I guess I'm struggling -- and if the answer is we don't have any, that's fine. I mean, from the standpoint it's much harder with private equity. But it's like they're skating, because they are under the guise of we're not a publicly-traded company. We're privately held. And yet, they're out there raising money from entities, such as ourself.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: You're raising very good and strong points. And I guess I'll cover it in a few ways.

Number one, you're highlighting one of the principal issues in the capital markets today, which is the nature of the governance, and -- with public corporations and the nature of governance of the private equity industry.

And I think it's fair to say there's been more

and more of a shift of capital into the private markets and away from the public markets. And that's one of the things that we discuss quite a bit, and that CalPERS has a vested interest to make sure that the health of both the public markets as well as the private markets, because both are very important to us to meet our return goals over time, and the governance structures of the 2 are disparate.

And I think we believe they're most likely beneficial elements to both the public and the private structure and working to ensure the health of both is very important. So capital market is a very important time right now where much of the talent is moving from the public into the private realm.

In terms of how to be most effective with the private equity general partners, and in turn the portfolio companies that they own, the strategy that we've employed is to work with our other limited partners. So for instance, the State of Washington, Theresa Whitmarsh has been a very strong advocate for increasing the diversity of the boards and management of private equity firms and their portfolio companies. And we regularly join meetings with her and other LPs to try and advance this topic.

But as Ms. Gogan was saying, it's a -- it's a -- it's a long -- it's a long push and a long

discussion, because of the rights are with the general partner in terms of the structuring of their own firms, as well as the portfolio companies they invest in.

understand, that, Mr. Eliopoulos. I guess the concern I have is on one hand we celebrate if they sign an environmental document with us on climate change. Yet, we don't seem to almost hold them to that. So on E, applaud. They're great. On the S and G, we don't hear much. So why is it we lack the leverage on the S and G that we have with the E?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Well, one,
I think it's -- it's an evolving -- it's an evolving area.
There are disparate approaches by different actors within
the marketplace. There isn't a accepted standard or
accepted belief around either best practices or changes to
be made for any given company in and industry. So it's
going to take time for this to sort out over time.

The data around environment and social is less -- less developed than under the G. And perhaps, that's why it's lagging farther behind in adoption, both in the public and in the private arena.

But the only -- the only answer to this question is to have both time, advocacy, and engagement to learn more, and push for better adoption in this area over time,

and hopefully demonstrate the increased performance as a result of attention to these areas. Ultimately, it's the performance that will drive the change more than anything.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Now, and I -- again, I want to appreciate all you all are doing. I mean, the fact that we're having this discussion is a testament to the hard work that you are doing. And it's great that we can call these folks out.

I mean, just one element. In your opening remarks you talked about our diversity summit in May. And what your data has shown is that diverse boards outperform -- outperform their benchmarks. So what I'm looking at is why aren't we holding private equity funds to that same standard that we're looking at a publicly traded company, because they'll say that they'll outperform.

And yet, over here on the private equity side, we don't hand it -- and if the data shows that they would outperform, why -- and they are a considerable element within the overall fund benchmark, why don't we push them?

Anyway. I mean, we can talk later, but that's just -- it just does concern me on the recent ride sharing company. It seemed a complete lack of control. And where is the management among the general partners and how do you address that? Because those type

of activities could end up cratering that entire company.

So thank you, Mr. Jones.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. You're welcome.

Mr. Lind.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you. Two questions.

First, you also included examples, which I appreciate, but it's not clear to me how these 2 examples relate to our ESG integration. Did we wind up investing with those managers because of all these wonderful characteristics, or did they do a number of these wonderful things, because in part we engaged with them over time.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: And so I think that it's a combination of both. I think this particular manager for both of the examples is Carlyle. And they have given us permission to share that information with the Board. And they view that our engagement in this space is extremely important in helping them continue to evolve.

They now have a chief sustainability officer and continue to focus more deeply on these ESG issues, because it matters to the bottom line, whereas, Ms. Taylor has pointed out moving towards trying to understand and evolve towards more measurement of these issues over time. But I

believe if Carlyle was before you, they would tell you that CalPERS, amongst one of several of their limited partners, has driven them to focus more on the ESG issues.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Great. That's the outstanding answer I wanted to hear.

Thank you. My second question --

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: And it happens to be true.

(Laughter.)

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: I'm sure. Yeah. Great. Thank you.

My second question on slide 19, about a vast majority of commitments include an ESG section in the side letter or limited partnership agreement. Can you just give me an overview of what is an ESG section?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: And so with respect to the ESG section, what we're counting by that is, if you will, a formally adopted ESG policy where the firm has a regimented way in which they evaluate ESG in a consistent basis across their investments over time.

The actual policy can and will differ across private equity firms, but we're looking for a formal commitment, and a regimented approach to evaluating those issues that we can look at. And then as part of our ongoing monitoring and management of the portfolio, we can

have access to their policy and see, okay, you said you would evaluate ESG risks and opportunities on your portfolio companies, help us understand how you're doing that. So it serves as a roadmap for us to help evaluate their commitment to the space over time.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: So what do we do -- and I guess this is probably similar to Richard's line of questions. We have this wonderful ESG section with a -- you know, with a general partner, and they are just blowing it off. Yeah, we signed off on this section as part of our limited partnership agreement, but we're not doing anything. What is our recourse? What do we do?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: I don't know that we've actually, I guess, ran into a situation as yet, where we have seen a general partner not following their ESG policy. The way they're crafted is reasonably broad, so that it describes activities and processes that they engage in just because -- if you think of the variety of different sectors that private equity firms invest in, the considerations for an energy company would be very different than those for a financial services company.

And so at this point, the policies are at a higher level, and they often indicate that we will consider these issues. We will evaluate them. They will be discussed in the investment memorandum. And, for

instance, an energy company is going to have much different metrics to try to evaluate how a private equity firm interacts with them than the other example I gave, a financial services company.

But I will tell you that staff has engaged at both the general meetings as well as the Limited Partner Advisory Committee meetings to discuss if there is not a sustainability report provided, why not? What are[sic] your activities been? Help us understand how you're continuing to think about those, because we are -- to use the baseball analogy, because we're getting close to baseball season, we're in early innings here with respect to ESG.

And so what we're seeing is right now a lot of the large State funds, a lot of the sovereign funds trying to engage limited -- or engage amongst themselves in the limited partner community, but also with the general partners to try to talk about these issues.

And what we're trying to do is one of our partnerships that Ted and Réal have talked about in the past is ILPA. One of the things that we're doing in partnership with ILPA is trying to get a standardized format of questions out there that we can use, so that other investors can start to see the importance and start to build some traction with foundations, corporates,

endowments, et cetera.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you.

I'm not at liberty to name names, because it was a private engagement, but I just wanted to give you a flavor of an engagement that Christine and I undertook together with a private equity firm, and it was on diversity issues.

And troubled as we were by the situation at the firm, and with support from Ted and from Réal, the senior people were engaged. And our request was, first of all, that we wanted a policy. We were looking for an implementation of new practices. We shared our expectations about diversity standards, diversity and inclusion with them, which we use with public companies. These were particularly on issues around gender and LGBT inclusion and respect. And Christine and I had progress reports.

In other words, able to see that hiring practices had improved, that they had formed new relationships, for example, with Toigo to better access the talent pool. We were able to share access to 3D with them. And I really -- I think that CalPERS -- I think there was a deep recognition by the firm that they really needed to pull

this altogether, but I think that we were able to engage in a very constructive way of over, it must have been about, 18-months to 2-year period Christine, wasn't it?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Yes.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: And there was tangible progress to the point about what can you measure? With them coming back to us looking at their hiring, their internships, the partnerships they were in development, and how they were going to roll-out their new policy of diversity and inclusion.

So I think speaking, even if you don't have the governance framework, the first thing we have is our voice. And as providers of capital, that can often be influential.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

It seems to me that private equity should be a space where there's great alignment around ESG and CalPERS and our managers, given the longer horizon than a lot of private -- public equity managers have, for example, and sort of without the pressure of short-term reporting and of returns, or profits, et cetera.

And given sort of what Ted alluded to earlier, sort of this shift from companies going public to sort of remaining private, or going from public to private, where

we have sort of a -- this -- a trend that seems to be occurring at the moment. It seems all the more important that we focus on ESG in private equity.

And so I'm really glad to hear about a lot of the efforts that you're undertaking. A couple of questions. One is in the public equity space, we have this set of Global Governance Principles. And it seems to me that a lot of that is really relevant for private equity. Do we apply that in private equity or do we have a similar set of principles in private equity? I mean things around, you know, the composition of a board, for example, having climate competent directors, or human capital management all seem very relevant for private equity?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: What we have done in private equity is we have obviously aligned with UN PRI principles in drafting and putting together our guidelines. But I think as several members of the Board have rightly called out, private equity is evolving in terms of prying to come to a consensus, if you will, as to what the guidelines and the considerations are that they're going to address. And so what we have done is really focused on the UN PRI principles to draft our guidelines to begin with, and serve as a springboard for engagement.

But I also want to indicate that we have also

developed a relationship with the American Investment Council to understand their principles. They got their start from UN PRI, and they carved out, because this -- you're aware, more so than anyone, Ms. Mathur, that UN PRI started in the public equity side of things. And as we've discussed here, private equity certainly has differences in terms of legal structure in how they do business longer term, et cetera.

So there was a group that carved out. It's now called AIC that carved out in 2009 that's tried to focus on some private equity specific considerations. And so what we've done in crafting our guidelines is to borrow from both and try to have as broad of a net as we can to just make sure that we're understanding the discourse around ESG issues as this continues to evolve.

And I think one thing that our guidelines attempted to call out is that, at this point, as the industry evolves, we want to start with UN PRI, but we want to remain open to other guidelines and bodies of principles as they evolve over time.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Yeah. It's Anne Simpson again. I also wanted to make a point about our own principles. When the Board with its ad hoc committee took an enormous amount of time over the last 18 months to revise, refresh, renew the principles, we deliberately

restructured them, so they'd be relevant to all the asset classes. And we restructured what was a very large document into 5 core issues, investor rights, Board quality, diversity, corporate reporting, incentives, and regulatory effectiveness.

And the reason for doing that was to find a structure, which was going to be relevant to all the asset classes. And in the preamble, we say that they're intended to be a reference point for consideration, notwithstanding all the difference that there is in ownership and control structures. And as some of the basic good work that ILPA is doing, and Christine and her team are working on is getting to that first step of getting the governance improved, because often we can't make assessments on those issues, because we don't have a line of sight, which obviously in the restructuring work and the development of the strategic partnerships, we're going to be in a better position as time goes. But our principles do have that broad -- that total fund scope.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: And just to underscore that, I would just mention that, recall that the principle went from being called the Corporate Governance Principles to the Global Governance Principles. Very important that those apply to the total fund in all

the asset classes.

Also, very importantly, those went from being a stand-alone Global Governance Policy, Global Governance Principles to actually being subsumed into the Total Fund Investment Policy, so very critically at the level of total fund. And then finally, even what you'll see in Agenda Item 9 is a revision of the principles. Those went through this governance structure of the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee, again to make sure that all the asset classes are on board and part of it.

It's a very -- I completely agree with your points and very important that it's across the asset classes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you. That's very helpful. I did have a couple more questions, if I might, and that is to what extent do we sit on advisory committees for GPs and for funds, and how -- and do we -- and how -- and do we bring these issues up in that context as well?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Absolutely. I'm very glad you asked that question. One of the rights that we typically try to secure with our commitment is the seat on the advisory board, which is referred to as the Limit Partner Advisory Committee.

I would say in almost all of the recent

commitments that we've done over the last 3 years, we have a seat on the Limited Partner Advisory Committee. We definitely proactively bring up the issue at our meetings, whether it be the Limited Partner Advisory Committee or the annual meeting. What you're seeing is with a lot of the larger firms, they have specific break-out sections just on either responsible investing, sustainability, ESG. They call it a variety of things, but it has a similar feel to it.

I will tell you that I was hoping you might give me an opportunity to ask, because our staff has brought it up. And one of the things that they brought up here just in the last couple of weeks is staff reported on a restaurant company diverting 90 percent of its paper waste to recycling uses, and an eyeglass manufacturer used 33,000 pounds less raw materials in one year.

We're measuring these kind of things, and engaging. It's more -- it's hard to say if it's just environmental, or it's environmental, social, and governance. It really depends on the particular situation. But I will tell you that staff is engaging and regularly reporting out on these things.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Great. Very exciting.

One last question. Lou gave a description of sort of the internal process and how the information

sharing was working internally within the fixed income group. Could you talk a little bit about with respect to private equity?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Sure. Absolutely. Happy to do that. And so within the -- there's 3 teams. There's an investment management team, there's an underwriting team, and there's the research team. What happens with respect to the underwriting team is when they're putting together a recommendation to make an investment, there is a section in their investment memo discussing the particular ESG considerations that are germane to that particular investment. It's shared with their team, the whole private equity team, and the investment review committee that evaluates whether or not to accept the recommendation to make the investment or not.

With respect to these 2 recent examples that I shared with you, what happens is the monitoring and management staff writes together short meeting notes from their engagement with the general partners. And that is shared with the monitoring team, and then that also flows up to the Investment Review Committee, so the entire staff has the benefit of seeing what is being discussed currently across private equity.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Terrific. Thank you

very much.

Good.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Yee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So given the uniqueness of this asset class, I'm not sure what the answer to this question will be, but -- it's just in relationship to the presentation preceding this. And as more GPs adopt ESG policies, and not necessarily the cause and effect being clear, and evaluation kind of taking place in different ways, and involving a diverse array of investments, do you see a point of where we're going to be able to assign an ESG score or just kind of some metric?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: So right now, we actually do, as part of our Manager Assessment Tool, which is a uniform way in which we evaluate all of our funds. There are points that are given towards ESG. And as the industry continues to develop, I would expect that the scoring pool tool would evolve along with the industry.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. All right. Good.

And then on slide 22, I was happy to see that over three-quarters of the strategic funds are submitting the template, which is terrific, but a little disappointed at the legacy funds.

So I guess what I wanted to ask about the ones

not submitting, are we getting the information and the reporting data that we need to incorporate into our CalPERS system?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: And so with respect to the strategic ones, one thing I know that Matt Flynn and Sarah Corr have been here to talk with you about PEARS.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Yeah.

 $\hbox{INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN:} \quad \hbox{And so you'll all} \\ \hbox{understand the time that it takes to build the system.}$ 

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Yes.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: With respect to the ILPA fee and profit sharing fee template, many firms have had to adopt their accounting systems, not unlike what we had to do with PEARS, in order to be able to provide the reporting for this fee and profit sharing report. So with respect to the strategics, we have understood that although we are receiving it - to your point Ms. Yee - from 75 percent now, the rest of the strategic partners are building systems, whereby we expect to have that information in the very near future for all of the strategics.

With respect to the legacy funds, it's really a question of how old some of those funds are. If some of the funds are so old, what we're understanding is that it

may not make sense for certain legacy funds to invest the time, effort, and energy to develop the fee and profit sharing template.

But our staff is, I assure you, continually engaging with all of our partners, as well as other limited partners to try to drive a broader industry adoption of this fee template, because I think that's really crucial to it serving as the standard for trapping this information on a consistent basis in the future.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Good. I'm glad to hear that. I obviously don't want to lose the momentum on that, so that's great.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: No, we -- I assure you, we focus on it, if not on a daily basis, for sure on a weekly basis, and the entire senior team is very focused on this.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Great. Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I have argued in the past, and will continue to argue, that we ought to develop our standards, and say these are our standards on fees, on ESG, on how you operate. And if you want our money, you've got to agree to meet those standards. So we will continue to have that argument.

However, Christine, you mentioned that in the -particularly, the commingled funds, we really have no
significant voice in board composition, and that. I mean,
we can bug them a little bit, but it's controlled by the
GPs. How is it different in the few funds of one that we
have created?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: So you're referring to the customized investment vehicles where they're --

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Correct.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: -- essentially a
separate account?

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Yeah, I think it really depends on the particular legal agreement, but to your point, Mr. Jelincic, if we have a separate account, we certainly have more governance rights there.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. And can you talk a little bit about what additional rights we manage to pick up in those separate accounts.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Sometimes we have the ability to indicate that we would maybe not go forward with a particular investment, for instance. That's one of the rights. We also -- obviously, another one is we can structure for certain sectors that are of particular interest to us at a time, which gives us more control of

the composition of the portfolio.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: And I was a little surprised that Ron didn't ask the question, but how do we monitor what impact our private equity portfolio is having on income inequality or do we?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: I don't know that we have the ability to do that in a robust manner at this time. So I think the honest answer to your question is we are not doing that right now.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. Fair enough. I would encourage you to think of how to do it going forward. And then on 22, you're probably going to be surprised that you would get a question about fees from me.

The -- one of the -- I'm glad that we're getting progress on the fee template, but one of the other templates was the 2011 fee on sources of information, sources of earnings. And are we making any progress on that?

And I'm going to tie it back to PEARS, because one of the things we've been told about PEARS is it will help us do attribution analysis, so we can figure out how we are making our money and where it's coming from.

So let me combine both the 2, and you can give us an update on PEARS and an update on the 2011 template, and

put them together.

2.4

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:
Certainly. Wylie Tollette, Calpers staff.

Overall, the PEARS project is in its final year. We expect to wrap it up by the end of this year, and we have two -- the first two phases are operational being used by Investment Office and Finance Office staff.

This last and final phase that we're working on really involves changes that we are implementing within the PEARS system to comply with AB 2833, the fee disclosure rule that is now in effect, and basically calculate and provide reporting around the gross-to-net IRR calculation by investment.

So that's sort of a high level PEARS update. As I said, we expect to be done by, I think, December of this year on the PEARS system. The template that you're referring to, I believe you're referring to the capital call and distribution template, which is the other ILPA template that we used to -- basically, whenever we get a distribution from a private equity investment or have a capital call to a private equity investment. And we are still collecting those. We have a very high percentage on the --

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Over 90 percent. CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

Yeah, we collect a vast -- the vast majority of our cap call and distributions have a template associated with them. And, yes, you're right, that's one of the primary input vehicles we use into the PEARS system for the data.

We have 2 years roughly built up of information associated with that capital call and distribution template. And that's not quite enough information to really use. That's not enough breadth of time has elapsed to use to draw terribly helpful information on attribution, but it's getting close. It's getting close. We think after another year of accumulating the data, we'll be able to at least have 3 solid years of information on flows and structures, so that we can begin to use that -- and portfolio company information, so that we can then begin to use that to really draw meaningful attribution information.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, because we need to know how we are making our money, where is it coming from?

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: Absolutely.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: We need it not just at the fund level, but at the company level. And that's one of the promises you've given PEARS, and I look forward

to it. And I can assure you I will ask the question again in less than a year.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: I would count on it.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mrs. Hollinger.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Thank you.

I just want to give a shout-out to staff and let me fellow Board members know I attended a women in private equity event, which probably has all the funds that we're invested in, and 500 representatives.

And when it came to ESG, you guys will be shocked, maybe in the room of people who focus, less than 15 people showed up. They -- and of those 15, some were European funds, and 2 were focused on emerging managers. So you guys are really fighting an uphill battle in trying to create something in an industry that, you know, hopefully, we're shifting in that direction, but I don't know that everybody really understands the context or enormity, they just are not focused on this issue.

But my question, Christine, I know the SEC just came out with a guide -- they're focused and their priorities, and they're focusing on advisors to public pension funds in terms of reporting and looking at our managers and conflicts. Do you think this will impact

that industry in terms of coming along?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: You know, it's certainly -- anecdotally, I'll offer you my opinion. And I will say that the SEA -- SEC, pardon me, their recent engagement with private equity firms has done a lot for limited partners in terms of having greater clarity around limit partnership agreements, and how, shall we say, general partners are interpreting the agreements and giving more transparency to limited partners. And so I would only speculate that continued engagement would be beneficial.

COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mrs. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Really, really good report back here. And I just am happy to see, because I know this is such a difficult asset class to integrate this into. And you had mentioned a couple of guidelines that you're using our own, as well as UN PRI to standardize what we do. But on page 18 of 35, you talked about what is the broader industry dialogue, and is there consensus around industry standards?

So that's my question to you. I mean, you talked about the broader dialogue, but I mean what is it -- that broader dialogue?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR GOGAN: Yeah. Thank you for asking the question. And it relates to what Ms. Hollinger was talking about. The point that we were trying to make is just given the stage at which the private equity industry is combined with the variety of sectors and investments that can be made, there aren't super clear industry standards that are uniformly adopted across the base that facilitate that dialogue.

I think Ted and Wylie had talked about SASB earlier. There is definitely the potential for adopting those in the private equity space to sort of, if you will, provide a consistent framework to help with that dialogue. But I think certainly don't want to declare victory to Ms. Hollinger's point. But I think what is going on is, although there were 15 people in the room you were in, you know, 3 years ago there would have been 1 or 2. And so, you know, it takes time, and it takes momentum.

When -- and I'm sure Ms. Simpson can correct me if my facts are incorrect here. But in 2006, when UN PRI started I think there were 6 signatories, 6 years later there were 1,000. So I think as people see the value that this engagement provides, you're going to see more people engaged, because they'll understand the value that it provides.

So I would -- long-winded way of answering your

question. But I think what we're moving towards is something like a SASB to help facilitate a consistent dialogue across the different sectors in private equity.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. Well -- and that's great to hear, because we definitely need that.

And then I had kind of a follow-up to J.J. And I wasn't going to -- and it's also a follow up to Mr. Lind, because he talked about the E being new, and that we've done some work on the G and the S, but I kind of see that we, in all of our asset classes - so it could be a question for all of you - that we don't focus on our human capital.

And then in addition to that, Mr. Jelincic's point of income inequality. And I know that what we decided on was we were going to do some research, but I think that there are portions of the S, the human capital, that we could be engaging on in any event, whether or not that falls under income inequality.

For example, how workers are treated, are
we -- is this part of the questionnaire, or the template
that you're using for private equity? Is it being
included in our global equities? Are we seeing a response
to - and I think Ms. Yee talked about this - a nimble
response to when violations occur when it comes to workers
across the world, not just in this country, but across the
world? Are we -- are we responding to that, because I

think that's a very important part of our ESG. No, we're not quite there to get income inequality, but that's the bare, you know, blank of where that starts, I think.

So anybody?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: That's a very big question --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: It is.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: -- in terms of how to respond to all working conditions across the globe. It's a big playing field. We have a very specific policy in our real estate portfolio and our Responsible Contractor Policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Right.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: It's a very specific policy. We have in our principles, as we'll see later, standards regarding human capital that are meant to be used across the entire portfolio. In fact, we used it in the context of the Dakota Access Pipeline engagement. So those principles are there to be used as engagement opportunities. And often, they come up in the context of either abuses or potential abuses that we see in the marketplace globally. And we use that principal screen to see where we might engage, both in the public company context where we have from time to time, as well as in the private context. You'll note that we've had several

public speakers here from time to time over the past few years in terms of human capital issues within private equity portfolio companies, and we regularly follow up with the general partners on those.

So it's a combination of having a set standard of principles and then applying them to conditions as they arise.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: And you said later on in the report you have the principles?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: They're the very next agenda item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Oh, there you go.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: I also wanted to flag another piece of work with our partners. As the Board will remember, when there were the tragedies in Bangladesh, the garment workers several years ago, many lives lost, it really raised this question about the supply chain, which took us back to companies which weren't even aware that they had people putting together their garments, and even less idea about really what was going on with health and safety.

Out of discussions with fellow investors, we helped to develop a framework on human capital management to use as a tool for taking to companies when we needed to talk about these issues, because as Ted said says,

these -- it's often when tragedy is brought to your door step, that we're called upon to respond. But we wanted some framework, which was aligned with our Investment Beliefs that would enable other investors, as well as ourselves, to work together.

I'm very pleased that the Human Capital

Management Group was formed with about 9 -- I think, just

under 19 different investors, and it's now chaired by

VEBA, which again I think is a wonderful example of where

an issue can come to us, we can do some work on a

framework. And we found it's been very effective engaging

other companies on human capital management issues.

So those sorts of frameworks are really important, because they translate what can often sound very vague, aspirational language into something specific that you can take to a company and ask for information.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

Mr. Lind.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Yeah, just quickly with respect to the income inequality piece. Our 5-year plan that we looked at earlier this morning included work around income inequality, research, and then potentially looking at an action plan based on that research, so that action plan may include details around integration with

the private equity or other asset classes, I think.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. That's the end of the questions on that one, we will now move to who's next?

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: We're moving on to real assets next.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: So I'll pass it over to Rina.

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: Thank you. Good morning. Rina Lessing, Investment Manager with Real Assets.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: It's a pleasure to be able to present to you today. So for real assets, our ESG integration efforts continue to evolve. We have incorporated the Sustainable Investment Practice Guidelines into our procedures manual. We have seen the ongoing adoption and implementation by staff, and increased engagement with managers regarding ESG risks and opportunities.

Real assets has supported the development of ESG related tools, metrics, and analysis. And infrastructure staff developed a proprietary ESG consideration matrix. A similar tool is under development and being finalized for real estate.

We also assess the capabilities of managers to incorporate ESG issues with an ongoing review of our Responsible Contractor Program Policy compliance, and reported energy use into ULI Greenprint.

This year, we will be able to review results from the Global Real Estate Sustainability Benchmark survey, otherwise known as the GRESB survey, for real estate and infrastructure managers.

So on to the next slide.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: One of the potential benefits of utilizing the GREBS -- GRESB survey is the use of standardized ESG aspects. GRESB collects ESG data around management, policy and disclosure, risks and opportunities, monitoring and energy management systems, performance indicators, certifications, and stakeholder engagement.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: On the next slide, we've provided a couple of examples of ESG integration in our portfolio. One is an office asset, City National Plaza, consisting of two 51-story buildings in downtown Los Angeles.

ESG strategies incorporated into the business plan included an update to the lighting system, better

controls for equipment, and installing efficient water fixtures. These efforts resulted in a 38 percent reduction in annual energy use, 40 percent reduction in annual water use, and approximately 4.3 million in annual savings.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: The next example is Desert Sunlight, an infrastructure investment in a solar powered generation project in Riverside County, California serving approximately 160,000 homes and displacing about 300,000 tons of CO2 annually.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: And last -- on the last slide, looking forward, we are planning for the roll-out of GRESB across Infrastructure and Real Estate. In the coming year, we look forward to engaging with our managers across the portfolio on sustainable investment aspects, performance, and benchmarking.

In addition, we have launched the Energy
Optimization Research Initiative with the objective of
identifying portfolio priorities in this area, as
mentioned in our Real Assets Strategic Plan.

And with that, I'm happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Seeing no questions on

25 that item, we'll move to the next one.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: Chairman Jones, members of the Investment Committee, good afternoon. My name is Simiso Nzima, Investment Manager, Global Equities.

Please bear with my raspy voice today. I seemed to have caught the bug.

Starting on slide 31, basically what I'm showing here is the 4 channels via which we integrate ESG into the global equity portfolios, active ownership or governance, responsible investments, sustainable investments, and manager expectations.

Today, I'll only focus on 2 of those 4 channels, the active ownership channel, as well as the manager expectation channel.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: Moving on to slide 32. Again, using the same framework that my colleagues are using the same UN PRI framework. On active ownership, really this is the core work of the corporate governance team. Active ownership allows us to maintain a seat at the table, and as a result, offers us the opportunity for dialogue and engagement to improve our corporate conduct.

Staff engages companies on ESG risk and opportunities through the 3 channels of proxy voting, shareowner campaigns, and corporate engagement.

The beauty of this approach really is it allows us to leverage both internal and external partnerships, a number of trade organizations externally. And internally, again going back to the theme of the day really, if you look at the Governance and Sustainability Subcommittee, the proxy working groups, those actually made up of staff across the enterprise, and relays that in the issues when we're discussing some of the work that we're doing in corporate governance.

One example of that is an example on the Montreal Pledge, where we're coming up with the engagement agenda on this. We have Divya Mankikar who's actually sitting here, and Craig Rhines, working together to come up with engagement objectives, and, even on a only weekly basis, Anne and I meet to talk about the 2 areas in terms of the hub, as well as the corporate governance to see what is out there, what are the things that we're thinking about, how to resource for certain activities and things like that. So that's on the active ownership approach.

At the February 13th Investment Committee meeting, I presented the 2017 workplan for the Corporate Governance activity. And I'll be back here towards the end of the year to present the results of the workplan.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: Moving on to slide 33,

this really talks about partnership expectations. And one thing I want to emphasize here is the breadth of, you know, the people involved in this area. So manager expectations do not fall under the corporate governance team. They fall under the portfolio evolution and strategy analysis team.

This is a team that is responsible for the oversight on all internal and externally managed portfolios in global equity. And this team holds both internal portfolio managers, as well as external portfolio managers accountable to the Global Equity Sustainable Investment Practice Guidelines.

And in terms of the activities in there, there's the selection, contracting, monitoring and management, and ongoing activities. But I'll focus on the monitoring and management.

Over the past year or so, as staff has been acquiring and integrating analytical tools to be able to monitor the global equity portfolio, both on an aggregate level, as well as individual portfolios. So on a monthly basis, they generate reports from MSCI ESG manager, which scores the global equity portfolio, both at an individual level as well as the aggregate portfolio on E, on the S, as well as on the G.

Once these reports have been generated, they are

then uploaded to an ESG trend dashboard. So this is the dashboard that tracks the ESG scores for the portfolio on a rolling 12 month basis. So staff is able to see graphically in terms of the trend on ESG scores for those portfolios.

If staff actually identifies an outlier, staff then carries out further report, where they're using assessed analytics or E -- MSCI ESG Manager Database to drill down to the key issue causing that outlier, as well as to the exact company.

Once staff has this information, they'll then engage the portfolio manager, 1, to make sure that the portfolio manager is aware of the issue; 2, to make sure that if the portfolio manager is aware of the issue, are they actually pricing this into their risk models, because again the thing -- when we look at active ownership is there could some issues associated with bad governance, but we want to make sure those issues are actually, you know, priced into the risk systems, and then also ask the manager whether there's an engagement plan.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: I'll move on to slide 34. Just like my colleagues did, I'll provide 2 examples from external managers in terms of applying ESG integration. The first example really shows the idea of

active ownership, active engagement, where the Manager I went in and engaged the company.

And the second example, this is where you look at actually pricing the ESG factors where, from a fundamental analysis, a factor-based analysis, the company looked really a good candidate for investment. But once an ESG screen was applied there, you could -- the manager realized that there were issues that were not priced in that company's price, so they ended up not investing in the company.

I'll move on to slide 35.

--000--

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: So this really shows some of the activities around the surveys that we do. We have an annual survey, which we actually do with managers. And this survey is actually shared with the corporate governance team in terms of actually the design of that. So we have that again cooperation between the Corporate Governance team, as well as the portfolio evolution and strategy team.

But one thing that I want to emphasize on GEs on the next steps in talking about the Global Equity ESG Research Project, it was the end of February this year, global equity launched a request for information RFI to get information from managers out there on investment

strategies, which have investment efficacy that integrate ESG.

Again, this is part of our -- you know, our learning and developing and looking out there to see what's going on in the market.

2.4

With that, I'll pause and take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Some managers have said they done particularly like --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Hold on, J.J.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Some managers have said they don't particularly look at ESG, because they're not really convinced that it has an impact on security pricing.

My question is have we ever fired a manager for paying insufficient attention to ESG issues?

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: Thank you for the question. I think -- so this is a relatively new area in terms of the surveys and -- something which has happened in the last 2 years or so. And so we're working through that. I don't believe we've ever fired a manager for not looking at ESG issues.

But one thing that I would like to point out is that sometimes the difference is how people view what ESG is. Because if you look at fundamental managers, the work

that you actually do when you are looking at a company, you're looking at corporate reporting, you're looking at strategy, you're looking at, you know, a lot of those issues, actually ESG issues.

So when you ask someone and say, are you incorporating ESG, they may say no. But if they're actually carrying out fundamental equity analysis, they're a fundamental stock picker, then they actually are. You know, they may not realize it.

So it -- again, it depends on the strategy that the manager is using, because if it's a quantitative manager, that's a different area, but if it's a fundamental stock pick again, you know, they are incorporating that without maybe explicitly referring to ESG.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: The only thing I would -- I would add to that is that similar to what Christine was saying earlier that it is part of our -- in global equity our Manage Assessment Tool. So as we're looking at managers both in looking to create contracts or, you know, looking for a new manager, but also in monitoring our existing, this is very much a part of the score. And, you know, kind of to lose point on the investments, you know, ESG is a consideration. It's one

of many. It's part of the mosaic as we try to make the best investment decisions that we can. But it is a critical part, it gets a score, and we have -- you know, we -- that score definitely contributes to the overall score that decides on selection or not.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, I just want to applaud, Ted, you and your staff for the outstanding work that you have done, and continue to do in the ESG space. It's evident that you and your staff have taken a leadership role in this area, because Ms. Gogan's response to Ms. Hollinger about a few years ago 1 person was in the room, but now there's 15. So next year, it may be 30.

And I've experienced that with Ms. Simpson when we were dealing with the 3D, corporate board of directors. I was engaged in a dialogue at one of her meetings at CII, and the first one we had I said, "Where are the people? Did you sent out an invitation?"

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: And then a couple years later, it was standing room only. They had to bring in chairs. So I -- it does take time, but I know that you guys are doing outstanding work, but it just takes time to have that permeate throughout the industry. So I just want to congratulate you on fine work you're doing.

Okay. Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

Well, I want to thank you for really sharing how information is shared between intern and external managers around key risks or ESG risks with respect to individual companies. That was interesting. And so I wanted to actually ask a question of Ms. Lessing. And I guess I didn't hit my button quite fast enough on real estate. So can I go back to real estate?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Sure. Sure.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: I was wondering if you could just talk a little bit more similar to the question that I asked of fixed income and private equity, sort of how the internal process goes, how you're sharing information, how you're learning from reach other internally?

Obviously, there's the sustainability -- governance and sustainability working group too, but within fix -- real assets.

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: So one of the ways we're sharing with each other is we have ESG as a regular agenda item with our external managers on a quarterly basis, along with other topics. And we will get together and share sector updates among our staff, which includes an outline of any ESG issues or opportunities of things

that have been discussed.

Another way that we share, and this is more, I guess, how we encourage our managers to share amongst each other. We're sort of learning more how to do that. One example of that is with our ESG -- I'm sorry, with our Energy Optimization Research Initiative. We'll hold roundtables which will have staff and external managers, kind of different property types, industry experts, and just have a -- just an open exchange of ideas.

But I think it's something we still continue to work on. It was one of our, kind of, lessons learned that we could do some more sharing. When we get reports back from our managers, when we're seeing their energy consumption, what are they doing best practices wise? It's something that we can certainly do more -- do more.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

If I -- and then I just wanted to make sort of a broad comment. Real ESG integration is sort of the gold ring for investors, I think. And it's something that none of us, nobody, has fully mastered yet. And I'm just so pleased with all of the progress and the focus, and attention, and energy that Calpers is putting into this effort. It is very hard to do, I think.

And I know some of the largest, you know, asset owners in the world are also similarly trying to do this

in an effective way. So I really just want to say how pleased I am with this strong start. And I know that we're going to continue to learn and continue to evolve, but I really appreciate all of your efforts.

So thanks.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Lee -- Yee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also wanted to go back to real estate for a moment, because there was, I think, a bit of reliance on the sustainability benchmark that is being developed. And I guess my question is if the -- if the system doesn't meet the needs of the project, is there -- are there alternatives that are available that we could use?

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: This is in terms of evaluating tools. You know, it is -- we are certainly early in evaluating GRESB. We had -- we're a co-founder of GRESB infrastructure, and so we -- on the infrastructure side of things, I think we're helping to develop the survey.

On real estate side, we do have a seat on the advisory board, and we'll continue to take a look at the questions being asked. There's 42 questions being asked, many subquestions. We may or may think some are really more applicable to our portfolio than others. So I think we will continue to be open-minded about evaluating other

tools to assess ESG in our portfolio. And we're -- we're early in -- in seeing once we -- once we get assessment reports back from GRESB, what it -- what it allows us to use them for and engaging with our managers on various ESG aspects.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. But you're not worried -- I mean, there's a lot out there that still can be drawn from to develop what we need?

INVESTMENT MANAGER LESSING: I think so. And I also think we can learn from our fellow asset classes, and, you know, SASB and see, you know, what's -- how this is evolving and are we able to -- are the tools we are using adapting to what the industry is doing.

So I think we were open-minded and we are -- we have a, I guess, a seat at the table on the advisory board, so...

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. Good.

And then I really like the slide 35 that we ended with that speaks to some best practices, and one of which is speaking about the -- tying integration to incentive compensation.

Do you see a point of where that actually, since we're all trying to move towards integration, to where that may not be a benefit, or are we still -- or is it still mostly viewed as a potential benefit to incentivize

integration?

2.4

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: I might be able to respond to that, Controller Yee. We have, in fact, incorporated ESG-related performance objectives into many of the Managers and Investment Directors and Managing Investment Directors, and COIOs, and CIOs for the Investment Office to date. And we think that is the right thing to do, and we think it aligns all of our interests around this effort.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Uh-huh. Will we ever get to a point of where that doesn't need to happen?

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

That's a -- that's a great question. I'm not sure. I think it's fair to say that people respond to incentives.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Sure.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE: And so I think that I would advocate that you get what you pay for. And so that -- this may be an area that you want to continue to look at and focus and structure, so as to align individual incentives with the organizational incentives.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Okay. Good. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Costigan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COSTIGAN: Just a couple quick

observations. I do want to thank all of you all for the work you have done. I know on one hand it looks like we've moved a little slowly. On the other, I'd like to say I started working on this issue back in 2003 after the recall. And if you recall, Governor Schwarzenegger carried on after Senator Pavley's tailpipe emission bill. And then with the introduction of AB 32, the Renewable Portfolio Standard, SB 1, and many of the other policies that Governor Schwarzenegger put into play.

So I don't want it lost on some of the policies that California adopted over a decade go -- actually now 16 years ago, that we're now seeing come to full fruition. Because I recall when we were doing AB 32, there were lots of discussion about this would never happen. You would never be able to get the reporting. You'd never be able to reduce the emissions.

And then when we SB 1, which was the solar -- the million solar roof initiative, and also in conjunction with the California Public Utilities Commission, no one believed that we would drive down the price of solar. No one would believe that would actually be able to put the rooftop on, and, in effect, we did.

And then the same thing with renewable -- with vehicles. No one assumed that we'd be able to use the PUC surcharge. And so again, the fact that you all are

showing this on the back-end really shows when you start with a public policy, and the implementation.

So I know I ask lots of pointed questions, but again it's just because I almost have a 2 Decade history of working in this space. And I remember being on the front end and taking a lot of arrows as to where we would eventually start, and where we've ended. So thank you all very much for this great report.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Moore.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER MOORE: I just had a quick question for Simiso on slide 35, your conclusions. On the best practices that you came up with looking at the survey summary, number -- the third from last one, integration tied to incentive compensation structure. What exactly is that and can you describe it a little bit for me, please.

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: Thank you for the question. So this is when we engage with managers. And part of the survey that we ask them is, you know, where the incentive for the portfolio manager is tied to the ESG integration. So our survey when we look at it, it really looks at the policy and processes, whether they actually have policy and processes, and the resources that actually putting aside to the integration of ESG in the investment

159

```
1 decision making.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

And so part of that ties to you have the resources in terms of humans, human capital, but also, you know, in terms of tying the compensation of those resources to the integration of ESG.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER MOORE: So you've seen that across some of the companies you've been looking at?

INVESTMENT MANAGER NZIMA: I don't think it's all companies. I think -- I think it's some of the companies, not all of them.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER MOORE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you. That's the last question on this item.

So now we will move to the next item on the agenda, which ic Global Governance Principles.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We're moving chairs a bit.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

20 CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: We'll 21 reassemble -- we've turned into a quartet.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was

presented as follows.)

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And we've got some other

25 guests.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: So, Anne, why don't we -- this -- so this is the annual review of our global principles. So in our policy, we bring back the principles once a year for review. Now, of course, this year follows the rather intensive subcommittee work we did on the principles last time. So as part of that process, we adopted a parking lot of issues. That parking lot of issues is listed as Table 1 in your agenda item.

And what we'd said at that time is that we would tackle a handful of those parking lot issues every year as we came back over the last 5 years. And circled in red are the -- are the parking lot items that we took a look at, and are proposing language to address those topics this year.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you very much, Ted.

Could you click the clicker, Wylie.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you. You see it's team work all around. If we could go to slide 4, because -- I have one job says Wylie. Well, it's one you do very well, so that's good.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Slide 4, because I think that Ted's introduction covered the first few

slides. What we've done here is show the list of topics that were raised during the review of the principles.

We've grouped them by theme, according to our core issues.

And what we want to do today is present to you some language, which picks up a series of concerns around the topic of capital allocation.

If we could go to the next slide.

--000--

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: We think the language that we currently have implicitly gives the Board responsibility for capital allocation. We touch on it. But the reason for really the deeper thinking, and more language on this topic right now is because in the U.S., our largest capital market it's expected that there will be a significant repatriation of capital, which is currently held overseas. Certainly, the newest administration has highlighted that as an objective.

So the question is as money comes back to the U.S., what is the highest and best use of that capital? There's been a lot of consideration about the potential impact of certain choices, like share buybacks on executive compensation. And this is where, in the best of intentions, investors have pushed over many years to have EPS and total shareholder return targets built into executive compensation plans, because these can be

inflated when there's a decision on a share buyback.

We've also seen some research which shows that companies don't time share buybacks as well as they might. No overall criticism there. Timing the market is a fool's game. We know it's an extremely difficult thing to do.

But there's also other dimensions to capital allocation, which have real importance to CalPERS.

Obviously, the investment for long-term value creation is something that's at the heart of the Investment Beliefs.

Also, there are other ways of deploying capital productively, be it paying off debt, mergers and acquisitions that are part of the company's long-term strategy, and obviously dividends, which are an alternative to the share buyback model.

Although, there are some wrinkles in that, because of the differential tax treatment as we all know. So the approach that we've taken on this language is, first of all, to acknowledge that this is a Board responsibility. That's important, because we know that some activist activity has focused on capital allocation. And we feel very strongly this isn't something you can work out on the back of an envelope. It's got to be integral to the strategy of the company.

So first, we're asking for is companies to set out their policy on capital discipline, explain how the

Board monitors and makes assessments for alternative potential uses of capital, and then to disclose this with the financial filings. And the reason for that is that it would make sure that this process goes across the desk of the CFO, and one hopes also the audit committee too.

On the disclosure, just to tie this in very carefully to the question of incentives, we're specifically asking the company to disclose if there is an impact on executive compensation, of the choice that's been made; and secondly, how they're addressing that potential conflict of interest.

So if we did have this information, I certainly think it would be valuable to us in understanding long-term value creation. And I hope also that this sort of disclosure would give us an opportunity to help companies fix their attention to the long term, because certainly the uses and abuses of short-term capital deployment are at the heart of discussions about being long term.

So with that, I'd be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Well, thank you. I do think this is important. I think -- I particularly appreciate the piece about tying it to executive

compensation plans and trying to at least get disclosure on where there might be conflicts or incentives for CEOs to pursue share buybacks, and other capital allocation strategies.

And I do think that this is actually also coherent with sort of our thinking around -- or our beginning process around economic inequality. Because I think one of the questions around capital allocation is, is capital best allocated in a short-term way back to investors, or shareowners, through share buybacks or is it better invested in the human capital of the company?

And so I think, you know, I'm sure this will continue to evolve, but I think this is a really important first step. So thank you for doing that.

I have one question about the areas for future review and development on page 4. One thing that has arisen recently, and you and I have discussed this, and Ted too, is non-voting shares and master trusts, and sort of what are the implications for us? And we don't currently have that on this list, but whether it's appropriate there. I think maybe we want to add it. I know you've already been doing some thinking around this. I don't know if you want to address that at this time.

To be fair, this list was meant to be new topics. And I

Yes.

Thank you.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON:

think the long-standing CalPERS principle of one share one vote is, if you like, that's a foundational piece. I think what we're finding with the -- certainly, with the recent IPO of Snap, and the engagement that we entered into through CII, in an attempt to persuade the company that it would be better to conform with standard governance in the U.S. market, all of that, but also through the master limited partnerships that are being increasingly used in the energy sector.

I think we've got to revisit this question of how we can balance capital formation, upon which we rely for returns in public markets with investor protection. And I was glad that at the SEC investor advisory group, as Ted mentioned earlier, this was one of the 2 topics on the agenda last week. And there was some, I think, very important debate that began about what are we going to do about private markets, which are a opaque, richly rewarded. And the public markets where we have the incredible shrinking number of IPOs, not just in the U.S., but around the world.

So I think this is a bigger topic about capital markets that we need to enter into, because, you know, we are being challenged on one of our fundamental tenets of investor protection. And if we can't turn to regulators to fill that gap, which we can't, we're left with sell

your shares or sue. And sell or sue is where we were 30 years ago when the corporate governance movement began. We've worked very hard to win voting rights on board accountability. So really this is an important topic.

But if we make some space for that, which I think Ted and I were talking about this the other day, we both agree this is a size -- there are seismic shifts. They're so perhaps imperceptible, but they are fundamentally going to affect us on investor protection internationally, not just here. So I think that's something we need to look at on the research agenda, not -- not in the next week or so, but Ted your thoughts.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: And probably not in the form of the principles language, as Anne just said, but it is a area for both research and partnership, and perhaps engagement over time that we're -- it's on -- is on the table for discussion.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

I -- my iPad just died on me, but is it appropriate at this time to also -- are you going to talk about the Dakota Access Pipeline or is that --

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Yes.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: What we're hoping to do is maybe finish on the principles -
COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Okay.

167

```
1
             CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: -- and the
    parking lot, and the proposed language, and then move to
 2
3
    the Dakota Access Pipeline once that's finish, if
 4
    that's --
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: That's fine.
5
                                                      Then I'm
6
    happy to move the staff's recommendation on the
7
   principles.
8
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: This is an information item.
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Oh, this is just an
10
    information item?
11
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah
12
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Oh, I'm sorry.
13
             INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON:
                                           Yeah.
14
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: As I said, my iPad just
15
   died on me, so forgive me.
16
             (Laughter.)
17
             CHAIRPERSON JONES: You're ready to go.
18
             (Laughter.)
             INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: What our thinking
19
20
    here is that this is going to be attached, as Dan
21
    mentioned, to the new Total Fund Policy, which is
22
    wonderful progress, because it means sustainable
23
    investment will be part of the overarching policy for the
24
    total fund. So the idea is subject to any changes or
25
    advice on this language, we would attach it for action
```

when the Total Fund Policy comes back to you for its final review.

I do want to also flag that we're proposing a name change, which is to make this -- these principles reflect the 5-year plan, and the terms of the Committee that we've -- that we've developed to implement, which is to go from calling it Global Governance Principles to Governance and Sustainability Principles.

So I didn't want that to go through. There might be Board members who feel very attached to the current title. So we'd like your -- any comments on that, too.

CHIEF OPERATING INVESTMENT OFFICER TOLLETTE:

And you'll have a chance to vote on the actual language on this in April when the Total Fund Policy that Anne just mentioned comes back to the Investment Committee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you. All right. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I won't harp on the one share one vote. But if we believe that, then we shouldn't be investing in things that don't comply with that.

And I do want to commend CII for at least starting a conversation with the index people about the

169

issue, because one of the -- when I asked the question at CII, it was well, it creates tracking error. So let's track the right thing.

But on the new language in capital allocation, I like this, but there seems to be one thing missing, and that is an explanation of why they made the decision. I mean, we've said, you know, tell us what your policy is. But when you actually make a specific implementation of that process, why? And it just seems to be missing in here. So I'll let you think about that, and maybe next time.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Yeah, let's think about that.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mrs. Yee.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 Actually, just kind of along the lines of Mr.

Jelincic's point. If this is to help us better understand

19 | long-term value creation, I do think there needs to be

20 | some explanation. So I would support some additional

21 | thought on that.

I am thrilled about the name change, so thank

23 you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

22

24

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Good.

25 | COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: And I wanted to just

comment about a couple of other issues on the parking lot list, if I could. It seems to me there are a couple of these that probably are going to be informed by a lot of the work that will continue, based on the presentation we just heard across asset classes.

But I just wanted to make a pitch for, particularly the water related or clean air issues, because they're so -- they're becoming more urgent.

And -- but I think we're going to learn a lot in the process of engagement as well. So I just wanted to put that out there.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Okay. So seeing no further questions on that, we have the Wilshire, do you have any comments on this item?

MS. DEAN: Nothing, other than to add that as we pointed out in our opinion letter, this is a sort of a living document, and risks, and markets change and regulatory -- that this is a living document and as the market environments and risk change that this should be, you know, considered an ongoing work.

This is Roses Dean from Wilshire.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Well, thank you. Then that -- this item will be back in April attached to the other document.

1 Okay. Thank you for that work.

We now move to --

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Actually,
Mr. Chair --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: -- we had the Dakota Access Pipeline engagement report.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh, yes. Yes. That's what I was thinking.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you very much.

At the last meeting, the Investment Committee directed staff to explore engagement options. So what you have as part of this report on the principles is a report back to what we've been exploring and doing since then.

Just to sum up very briefly, you'll recall that the Dakota Access Pipeline is a over 1,000 miles long. At the final stage, there was protests. Important to note the protests came from indigenous peoples, and they were later joined by environmentalists who were flagging climate change issues.

What we've focused on here is setting out the details and our ownership exposure in the entity, the master limited partnership responsible for the construction. And we've also given you a brief report on

the conversation that we've had with the master limited partnership.

The dialogue that we've initiated with the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, the beginning of engagement with the banks who are financing not just this, but much of the rest of the pipeline development in this rapidly growing sector, and the potential that we'll be coming forward for the proxy votes.

And thank you, Ted, we've, since this report was completed, also had an opportunity to talk to labor, both the AFL-CIO and the Laborers Union, because again, on capital framework, this is an extremely important part of the consideration.

What I think you can conclude from this, although we're not making recommendations at this stage, is that because the master limited partnership is structured as such, we do not have voting rights, which mean that we can't pursue our usual course of engagement that we would in situations like this.

So what we've done is turn to the banks where we have some significant exposure, around six and a half billion dollars, and begun to engage the lead banks who are financing this. And what we've done in the course of our research on the bank's policies is find that many of them, 13 out of the 17, are signatories to something

called the Equator Principles.

And the Equator Principles were developed by the IFC, which is part of the World Bank, to require that in the covenants for project finance loans over a certain amount, there should be an environmental impact assessment, and there should be a requirement for free prior and informed consent.

Now what it appears on this occasion is there's a question about how those commitments under the Equator Principles rolled through into the decision for the Dakota Access Pipeline. A number of the banks involved led by Citi and TD, Toronto-Dominion in Canada, have commissioned an independent review of how their principles were, or weren't, or in what way they were applied on this occasion, and to see what lessons learned there might be.

And they're also looking with fresh eyes at the whole process of environmental impact assessment and consultation for ETP, the master limited partnership.

When that report is completed, I think we'll have another third-party view of what's taken place. I would though like to report that I've been very -- we've really appreciated having the opportunity to speak to management at the master limited partnership. We've had several calls with them. We very much appreciated the leadership of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, who made a special trip

to come to CII and ICGN, so we could host a meeting for them to talk to investors. And also the banks have been very responsive.

We also have been flagged for us by the unions that there are challenges on environmental impact, and impact on communities that are arising across the sector. And I think this is something therefore for us to watch, and certainly we -- and I'm not sure that until we can get that independent report from Foley Hoag that we have a lot more to add at this stage.

A final note is that there will be a number of shareholder proposals that we expect to vote on around this topic, notably one at Marathon Oil, which is one of the funders of the master limited partnership. Marathon did appeal to the SEC to ask that a, what's called, no action letter be granted so the proposal wouldn't go ahead.

And to the SEC's credit, they've allowed it to stay on the ballot. So there may be others as well, but that certainly is one vote that's going forward.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mrs. Mathur.

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

Well, I just wanted to thank you and the team for acting so expeditiously on this. It is an area where the

time is of the essence. And while we may not have been able to halt the construction, maybe -- you know, at least engaging around the process and moving forward, particularly around the environmental and other Equator Principles that -- I think that's very important work, and we will be in this market for a long time to come.

So -- so the more robust the review and pre-work done, the better. And so I look forward to hearing what happens with shareholder proposals, as well as the continued engagement both with the banks and with some of the other companies.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Lind.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you. I also wanted to compliment you on the amount of work done on this in a short period of time. And, you know, particularly the work we and other investors are doing around engaging with the banks is very meaningful and a great example, and why divestment is not a good idea, because we do lose our voice, as somebody described earlier. But having said that, I do have to take this bait here regarding ETP.

I mean, you've listed -- they're in violation of everyone of our governance principles, our Investment Beliefs. There's certainly, the -- you know, the environmental issues. You know, they probably hate

puppies and kittens too. I mean, this is -- this is not a good company.

So I guess my question is how far off of our Investment Beliefs and principles does a company have to get before we just determine this is not a company we want to be part of? I mean, when do we -- how do we make that decision, and when do -- or how do we even get into an investment with a company that is so far off of those principles?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Well, the starting point is with our index, and the index providers, and the exchanges. And that's the area that I, and Anne, and Dan will be paying much of our attention going forward, and what the standards are, because we're a buyer of this index that includes these holdings.

In terms of divesting of individual companies, that comes under the rubric of our Investment Beliefs and our principles. And particularly when it comes to human capital, we have, in the past, applied that screen to emerging markets. But if you remember, one of the changes that we've made to our principles is to make that section on human capital apply throughout the portfolio.

So in terms of looking at a particular company and seeing if actions are so egregious that they would meet the standards for divestment, that's the -- that's

the screen that we'll undertake or would undertake.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Yeah. In this case, I'm not focusing so much on the human capital, as I am on the governance issues here. You know, we -- as you identify, we have no voting rights, and, you know, diversity, and all the other issues that we talk about all the time that are part of our principles, this company guess an F minus.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: And that's why it will be important to engage with the indexes and the exchanges to talk about listing requirements.

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Thank you.

MANAGING INVESTMENT DIRECTOR BIENVENUE: Yeah.

And for what it's worth, Mr. Jelincic mentioned the -- I

believe it was Ms. Jelincic mentioned the index discussion

around, you know, some of the leadership that's been

taken. We have very much participated in each of those

discussions, and we'll tonight. Because to Ted's point,

we really think one of the places where we can be

impactful is with the indexed methodology on inclusion or

not inclusion, and then listing requirements for even

coming public in the United States, and others.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Mr. Jelincic.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. On the index, we managed to find an index that's tobacco free, and Sudan free, and Iran free, guns free, so we can find an index or

have one created for us.

But my question was actually on page 6 of 7, where you talked about a provision in the Dodd-Frank that basically forced ETP to have a special meeting. Can you enlighten me what that was, and was it just because they were increasing the number of shares or...

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: It's because it's a publicly limited -- entity.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: I'm sorry?

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: As a publicly -- as a public entity, it's listed, the Dodd-Frank provisions around say-on-pay apply to the company. And so for the share capital that they needed to issue to fund the executive compensation, that was the provision underwhich this vote. So that is the sole vote that we've been able to cast to ETP, according to our records.

COMMITTEE MEMBER JELINCIC: So let's keep say-on-pay as one with those Dodd-Frank things we want to defend.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Yes. Thank you.

So I'd like to reiterate what Mr. Lind said.

24 That was going to be one of my things that I was going to 25 say. It's just such an egregious company that I just have

a hard time understanding why we still invest in. And I understand our divestment purposes, but it's -- it doesn't meet any of our standards in terms of our governance principles, so I really -- it's just a horrible company.

But, be that as it may, what I'd really like to know, you had mentioned the Equator Principles. So I wonder if at a future meeting, you could give us some more information on the Equator Principles, and how we can work with other investors to incorporate these principles into our long-term interests in the financial sector, if that would be okay?

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yes, that would. Staff -- the Chair is directing staff to -- at a future date, to provide that information.

INVESTMENT DIRECTOR SIMPSON: Thank you. We'd be glad to.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Sure. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Ms. Yee

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So I also want to just thank the staff for moving so diligent and quickly in terms of the engagement. I guess a couple things, thoughts here that just my head keeps wrapping around, and that is, you know, this is all triggered by the issue of the pending legislation coming before us. And I hope we can actually feel comfortable

with having a process. And I know our CEO Ms. Frost has been before the legislature, and just really speaking about all the not-so-positive aspects of divestment that we are very, very active in engagement.

And I would like to have the rest of the legislature just understand why that's important. And so -- you know, we were kind of in a position of taking a stand on this bill. And I'm not so sure the author necessarily understood, you know, kind of our work in the area of engagement. And I think just short of even having the opportunity to take a position on a bill, that should be just kind of a regular presentation by our legislative staff on any bills like this.

Now, having said that, the other thing that this bill triggered for me is the whole engagement process that we just spoke about this morning. It suggests to me that we probably need to rethink some of the trigger points for engagement in a more proactive way.

And so, I mean, I think there's some lessons learned here about, you know, just kind of how to proceed. So we know there's legislative interest. We have a -- we've had a long-standing policy with respect to divestment. I think the legislature should understand that, and to the extent it can, embrace it.

But then at the same time, understanding where

those concerns are with the legislature, then with this process that we've just talked about this morning, that's become more robust across all asset classes to see what we need to do to just hopefully look at whether there are some events, or facts, or circumstances that trigger, you know, that engagement in a more urgent way.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, I -- would you add that to the parking lot issues, so that -- at the appropriate time to come back with the information as to whether we leave it the same, whether or not we add the processes to it, or modify our process.

You know, one of the things you mentioned is reaching out to the legislature. And I don't know, are you referring to staff reaching out or are you referring to Board?

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Yeah. Sometimes I think when we are presenting -- and this happens with both pension funds on which I serve, where, you know, obviously to the extent that there are bills that affect that -- our business, we -- they rightfully come before us, and we are expected to take a position, or at least have some deliberation about them.

To the extent that we've had this policy of not divesting, I just want to be sure that policy is well understood. It's politically charged. I think it's a

```
tough conversation to have when you feel so passionately about, you know, things like a company not really, you know, compliant with many of the principles that we believe in.
```

On the other hand, I think, you know, as has been demonstrated, engagement really gives us more leverage, and -- for change. And I just would like to spend that time to -- with some of our key stakeholders in the legislature to have them understand what that means. So I think that's part of the work -- the ongoing work with the legislative staff. And as I said, Ms. Frost has been doing that as she's --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So we're not talking about -- because we just adopted a divestment policy.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: No, no, no, no. No, no, no I'm not. I'm not changing that. This issue just raised a lot of different things about our existing processes that --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: More reaching out to the legislature to have a clear understanding.

COMMITTEE MEMBER YEE: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: I think that's appropriate.

Okay. That's the last item that -- on this item.

So now, we will go to summary of committee

25 direction.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: I think I got it. Yeah. Wylie and I have been conferring. See if I got them all.

There are three main items. One, the Chair directed that we provide the Committee with a copy of the green finance plan. We will do that.

Number 2, to schedule sometime in the future a discussion of the Equator Principles. We'll probably time that in conjunction when we hear back on the report from the independent entity that has been hired to review the Dakota Access Pipeline, activity by the banks, so we'll just time that at that time.

And then third, direct staff to talk with legislative staff about our divestment policy and engagement policies as educational, and an information sharing effort.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: In addition to that, there were a number of word changes that were made to the -- Agenda Item 6a, I believe it was, 6a. We have each of those. If you'd like us to go through each of those --

CHAIRPERSON JONES: No, I think it's okay.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: -- the

25 words I think are very clearly put out. We have those,

and we'll take those as read.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Yeah, that's clear. Yeah. Okay. Okay. Very good.

Okay. Thank you.

We do have public comment. We have a request to speak, Mr. Moran and Mr. Pittz.

If you'll come down to the microphones here and please state your name and you will have -- each of you will have 3 minutes to speak. And there's a clock right in front of me right here, which you will start as soon as you start talking.

MR. MORAN: My name is Jose Moran. I have been working at Tesla at the Fremont factory for about over 4 years now. I'm proud to contribute to a company that is leading the charge to meet the rising demand for electric vehicles, and building a more sustainable economy.

Recently, my colleagues and I have begun speaking out about the problems with the working conditions at Tesla, especially safety and health risks. I'm really concerned about the ramp up that's about to happen with the Model 3 production goals, and whether this will be possible for us without first improving safety conditions.

Preventable injuries often happen, because we are not being rotated through different jobs often enough, do not have the appropriate ergonomic equipment, and are not

properly trained on the job.

For example, last year for quite a few months, the majority of my work team was out on medical leave due to work-related injuries. Unfortunately, many of my co-workers are scared to raise concerns like these to our management team at Tesla. Colleagues who are hurting are often too afraid to speak up. They're -- for fear of being labeled a complainer, a bad worker, or for fear of retaliation.

The company also recently asked us to sign a confidentiality policy that has made many people even more worried about what would happen if they speak up.

I share some of these same fears, but I'm here today because my co-workers and I hope we can start a productive conversation about building a fair future for everyone at Tesla.

The conditions that we faced at work also impact the quality and the speed of the production line. We believe these issues can be resolved if we have a voice in the workplace, and are included in the process of collective bargaining.

As workers, we are invested in helping Tesla succeed, and we know that you are too. Thank you.

MR. PITTZ: Good afternoon. My name is Will Pittz and I'm with the United Auto Workers union. Tesla

is in a lot of ways an inspirational company that is on the forefront of building a strong green economy. And we believe, and we hope that you also believe, in the company's potentially world changing clean energy aspirations, and we sincerely want the company to succeed.

We're here to today to talk about risks at Tesla that could jeopardize their success. The importance of solid human capital management practices for long-term value creation is clearly enshrined in CalPERS' published Investment Beliefs.

We believe that there are risks associated with the company's human capital management. These risks have been articulated clearly by Jose, Moran, and his co-workers, and should be of concern to Calpers as an institution.

The UAW has heard from hundreds of workers at Tesla who have shared similar concerns to those you've heard today. And so far, CEO Elon Musk's response to those concerns has been overwhelmingly dismissive.

Mr. Musk has first responded directly to Jose Moran by questioning his honesty. Subsequently, in a company-wide email, Ms. Musk responded to these real workplace concerns by again disregarding that there are any problems at all, and instead promised frozen yogurt stations and a roller coaster.

We'll be reaching out to other Investors in the future, who share a similar fiduciary responsibility in relationship to this company. But today, we ask that CalPERS engage with Tesla about its human capital management practices, including labor practices, as well as health and safety.

We believe that this is consistent with CalPERS' stated Investment Beliefs, and vital to the success of the company, and the well-being of all of its workers and their families.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Thank you for your comments.

Okay. That concludes the agenda for open session.

Why don't we take a -- why don't we adjourn, and then we'll go right into closed session, because looking at the agenda, I think we can conclude it in a few minutes. So we're going to adjourn the open session. Then as soon as the auditorium is clear, we're going to go right into closed session.

(Thereupon California Public Employees'
Retirement System, Investment Committee
meeting open session adjourned at 1:18 p.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand 3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the 4 foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System, 5 Board of Administration, Investment Committee open session 6 7 meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, 8 a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, 9 and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by 10 computer-assisted transcription; I further certify that I am not of counsel or 11 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any 12 way interested in the outcome of said meeting. 13 14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 15 this 17th day of March, 2017. 16 17 18 19 James & 20 21 22 23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR 2.4 Certified Shorthand Reporter

25

License No. 10063